arXiv:1603.07437v1 [math.RT] 24 Mar 2016

Lie algebras constructed with Lie modules and their positively and negatively graded modules[1]

Nagatoshi SASANO

Abstract

In this paper, we shall give a way to construct a graded Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ from a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ which consists of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ which has a non-degenerate invariant bilinear form B_0 and $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (ρ, V) and $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$ all defined over a field $\mathfrak{k}$. In general, we do not assume that these objects are finite-dimensional. We can embed the objects $\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}$ into $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. Moreover, we construct specific positively and negatively graded modules of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. Finally, we give a chain rule on the embedding rules of standard pentads.

1 Introduction

A standard quadruplet is a quadruplet of the form $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite-dimensional reductive Lie algebra, (ρ, V) a finite-dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ and B_0 a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ all defined over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$, which satisfies the conditions that ρ is faithful and completely reducible and that V does not have a non-zero invariant element. In [9], the author proved that any standard quadruplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ has a graded Lie algebra, denoted by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} V_n$, such that $V_0 \simeq \mathfrak{g}$, $V_1 \simeq V$ and $V_{-1} \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C})$ (see [9, Theorem 2.11]). That is, any finite-dimensional reductive Lie algebra and its finite-dimensional faithful and completely reducible representation can be embedded into some (finite or infinite-dimensional) graded Lie algebra. We call a graded Lie algebra of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ the Lie algebra associated with a standard quadruplet. Some well-known Lie algebras correspond to some standard quadruplet, for example, finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras and loop algebras. Moreover, the bilinear form B_0 can be also embedded into $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$, i.e. there exists a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ whose restriction to $V_0 \times V_0$ coincides with B_0 (see [9, Proposition 3.2]). By the way, H. Rubenthaler obtained some similar results in [8] using the Kac theory in [3].

The first purpose of this paper is to extend the theory of standard quadruplets to the cases where the objects are infinite-dimensional. For this, we need to consider pentads $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$

[1]**Key Words and Phrases**: Graded Lie algebras, Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras, Standard quadruplets
2010 Mathematic Subjects Classification: Primary 17B70; Secondary 17B65

instead of quadruplets, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a finite or infinite-dimensional Lie algebra, $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes V \to V$ a representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on a finite or infinite-dimensional vector space V, $\mathcal{V}$ a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$, B_0 a non-degenerate invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ all defined over a field $\mathfrak{k}$. In general, we do not assume that B_0 is symmetric. We define the notion of *standard pentads* by the existence of a linear map $\Phi_\rho : V \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathfrak{g}$ satisfying $B_0(a, \Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi)) = \langle \rho(a \otimes v), \phi \rangle$ for any $a \in \mathfrak{g}$, $v \in V$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$. A standard quadruplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ can be naturally regarded as a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}), B_0)$, and, thus, we can say that the notion of standard pentads is an extension of the notion of standard quadruplets. Then, by a similar argument to the argument in [9], we can construct a graded Lie algebra from an arbitrary standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ denoted by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n$ such that the objects $\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}$ can be embedded into it. We call such a graded Lie algebra *a Lie algebra associated with a standard pentad*. This is the first main result of this paper. Of course, the graded Lie algebra associated with a standard quadruplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ is isomorphic to the graded Lie algebra associated with a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}), B_0)$. Moreover, if the bilinear form B_0 of $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is symmetric, then B_0 can be also embedded into $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, i.e. there exists a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form B_L on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ whose restriction to $V_0 \times V_0$ coincides with B_0.

When B_0 is symmetric, we can expect that a Lie algebra of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ (not necessary finite-dimensional) and its representation can be embedded into some graded Lie algebra using B_L. The second purpose is to construct positively graded modules and negatively graded modules of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ which can be embedded into some graded Lie algebra under some assumptions. In general, it is known that for any graded Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l} = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{l}_n$ and $\mathfrak{l}_0$-module U, there exists a positively (respectively negatively) graded $\mathfrak{l}$-module such that the base space (respectively top space) is the given $\mathfrak{l}_0$-module U (see [2, Theorem 1.2]). In this paper, we shall try to construct such $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules from a $\mathfrak{g}$-module (π, U) using a similar way to the construction of a Lie algebra associated with a standard pentad. Precisely, we inductively construct a positively (respectively negatively) graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$, $\tilde{U}^+ = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} U_m^+$ (respectively $(\tilde{\pi}^-, \tilde{U}^-)$, $\tilde{U}^- = \bigoplus_{m \leq 0} U_m^-$) such that the "base space" U_0^+ (respectively the "top space" U_0^-) is the given $\mathfrak{g}$-module U. In general, the modules $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$ are infinite-dimensional. We shall try to embed $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and its module of the form $\tilde{U}^+$ into some graded Lie algebra. If we assume that B_0 is symmetric and that U has a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathrm{Hom}(U, \mathfrak{k})$ such that $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ is a standard pentad, then we can embed the objects $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $\tilde{U}^+$ into some graded Lie algebra. Precisely, under these assumptions, we have that a pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is also standard, and, thus, we can embed the objects $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, $\tilde{U}^+$, $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$ into the graded Lie algebra $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$. In this situation, we have a "chain rule" of the Lie algebras associated with a standard pentad. This is the second main result of this paper.

This paper consists of three sections.

In section 2, we shall study the Lie algebras associated with a standard pentad. First, in section 2.1, we define the notion of standard pentads (see Definition 2.2) and construct a graded Lie al-

gebra from a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, which is denoted by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} V_n$ (see Theorem 2.15). In section 2.2, we consider some properties of Lie algebras of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ such that B_0 is symmetric. In these cases, we can also embed the bilinear form B_0 into $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, i.e. we can obtain a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ whose restriction to $V_0 \times V_0$ coincides with B_0 (see Proposition 2.18). Moreover, the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ can be characterized by the transitivity and the existence of such a bilinear form (see Theorem 2.20). Finally, we give two lemmas on derivations on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ (see Lemmas 2.37 and 2.38).

In section 3, we shall study positively and negatively graded modules of a Lie algebra of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. First, in sections 3.1 and 3.2, we shall construct positively graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module and negatively graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module from a $\mathfrak{g}$-module (π, U), i.e. we shall give another proof of [2, Theorem 1.2] in the special cases where the graded Lie algebra is of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. In section 3.1, we construct a family of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $\{U_m^+\}_{m\geq 0}$ (respectively $\{U_m^-\}_{m\leq 0}$) from the pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and the $\mathfrak{g}$-module (π, U) by induction. In section 3.2, we define a structure of positively (respectively negatively) graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module on $\tilde{U}^+ := \bigoplus_{m\geq 0} U_m^+$ (respectively $\tilde{U}^- := \bigoplus_{m\leq 0} U_m^-$). We call this positively (respectively negatively) graded module of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ the *positive extension* (respectively *negative extension*) of U with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ (see Theorems 3.12 and 3.14). These modules are transitive and characterized by their transitivity (see Theorem 3.17). In sections 3.3 and 3.4, we try to construct a standard pentad which contains a Lie algebra of the form $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and its module of the form $\tilde{U}^+$. For this, we need to assume that B_0 is symmetric and U is embedded into some standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$. In section 3.3, for the $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathrm{Hom}(U, \mathfrak{k})$, we shall extend the canonical pairing $U \times \mathcal{U}$ to $\tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$. Moreover, in section 3.4, we shall construct the Φ-map of $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ from the Φ-map of the pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ inductively. Consequently, under the assumptions that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ are standard pentads and that their bilinear form B_0 is symmetric, we can embed the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and its module $\tilde{U}^+$ into a standard pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$. Finally, in section 3.5, we consider the graded Lie algebra $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ under the situation of sections 3.3 and 3.4. From the constructions of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$, we can write this graded Lie algebra using the data $\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0$ and $U, \mathcal{U}$. Precisely, we have the following result on the structures of Lie algebras:

$$L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) \simeq L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0).$$

This is a chain rule in the theory of standard pentads (see Theorem 3.26).

Notation 1.1. In this paper, we regard a representation ρ of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ on V as a linear map $\rho : \mathfrak{l} \otimes V \to V$ which satisfies that

$$\rho([a, b] \otimes v) = \rho(a \otimes \rho(b \otimes v)) - \rho(b \otimes \rho(a \otimes v))$$

for any $a, b \in \mathfrak{l}$ and $v \in V$.

Definition 1.2. In this paper, we say that a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-*graded Lie algebra* or simply a *graded Lie algebra* if and only if there exist vector subspaces $\mathfrak{l}_n$ of $\mathfrak{l}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that:

- $\mathfrak{l} = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{l}_n$ and $[\mathfrak{l}_n, \mathfrak{l}_m] \subset \mathfrak{l}_{n+m}$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- $\mathfrak{l}$ is generated by $\mathfrak{l}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{l}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{l}_1$.

In general, we do not assume that each $\mathfrak{l}_n$ is finite-dimensional (cf. [3, Definition 1]).

Moreover, if $\mathfrak{l}$ satisfies the following two conditions, we say that $\mathfrak{l}$ is transitive (see [3, Definition 2]):

- for $x \in \mathfrak{l}_i$, $i \geq 0$, $[x, \mathfrak{l}_{-1}] = \{0\}$ implies $x = 0$,
- for $x \in \mathfrak{l}_i$, $i \leq 0$, $[x, \mathfrak{l}_1] = \{0\}$ implies $x = 0$.

Definition 1.3. In this paper, we say that a module (ϖ^+, W), $W = \bigoplus_{m\geq 0} W_m$ (respectively (ϖ^-, W), $W = \bigoplus_{m\leq 0} W_m$) of a graded Lie algebra $\bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{l}_n$ is positively graded (respectively negatively graded) when $\varpi^+(\mathfrak{l}_n \otimes W_m) \subset W_{n+m}$ (respectively $\varpi^-(\mathfrak{l}_n \otimes W_m) \subset W_{n+m}$) for any n, m (cf. [2, Definition 0.1]), and, moreover, we say that a positively graded module (ϖ^+, W) (respectively a negatively graded module (ϖ^-, W)) is transitive when the following condition holds (cf. [2, Definition 1.1]):

$$\text{for } w \in W_m,\ m \geq 1,\ \varpi^+(V_{-1} \otimes w) = \{0\} \text{ implies } w = 0$$
$$(\text{respectively} \quad \text{for } w \in W_m,\ m \leq -1,\ \varpi^-(V_1 \otimes w) = \{0\} \text{ implies } w = 0).$$

Notation 1.4. In this paper, we denote the set of all natural numbers, integers and complex numbers by $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ respectively. We denote the set of matrices of size $n \times m$ ($n, m \in \mathbb{N}$) whose entries are belong to a ring R by $M(n, m; R)$, the unit matrix and the zero matrix of size n by I_n and O_n respectively. Moreover, δ_{kl} stands for the Kronecker delta, $\mathrm{Tr}(A)$ stands for the trace of a square matrix A.

2 Standard pentads and corresponding Lie algebras

2.1 Standard pentads

Let us start with the definitions of Φ-map and standard pentads.

Definition 2.1 (Φ-map)**.** Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a non-zero Lie algebra with non-degenerate invariant bilinear form B_0, $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes V \to V$ a representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on a vector space V and $\mathcal{V}$ a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$ all defined over a field $\mathfrak{k}$. We denote the canonical pairing between V and $\mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and

the canonical representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathcal{V}$ by ϱ. Then, if a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ has a linear map $\Phi_\rho : V \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathfrak{g}$ which satisfies an equation

$$B_0(a, \Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi)) = \langle \rho(a \otimes v), \phi \rangle = -\langle v, \varrho(a \otimes \phi) \rangle \tag{2.1}$$

for any $a \in \mathfrak{g}$, $v \in V$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$ (cf. [9, Definition 1.9]), we call it a Φ-map of the pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. Moreover, when a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ has a Φ-map, we define a linear map $\Psi_\rho : \mathcal{V} \otimes V \to \mathfrak{g}$ by:

$$B_0(a, \Psi_\rho(\phi \otimes v)) = \langle v, \varrho(a \otimes \phi) \rangle = -\langle \rho(a \otimes v), \phi \rangle. \tag{2.2}$$

We call this map Ψ_ρ a Ψ-map of $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$.

In general, a pentad might not have a Φ-map. If a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ has a Φ-map, then the equation (2.1) determines the linear map Φ_ρ uniquely. Moreover, we have an equation

$$\Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi) + \Psi_\rho(\phi \otimes v) = 0$$

for any $v \in V$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$.

Definition 2.2 (Standard pentads)**.** We retain to use the notation of Definition 2.1. If a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ satisfies the following conditions, we call it a *standard pentad*:

$$\text{the restriction of } \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \text{ to } V \times \mathcal{V} \text{ is non-degenerate,} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\text{there exists a } \Phi\text{-map from } V \otimes \mathcal{V} \text{ to } \mathfrak{g}. \tag{2.4}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Under the notation of Definitions 2.1 and 2.2, we have the following claims:*

$$\textit{if } V \textit{ is finite-dimensional, then a vector space } \mathcal{V} \textit{ satisfying (2.3) coincides with } \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k}), \tag{2.5}$$

$$\textit{if } \mathfrak{g} \textit{ is finite-dimensional, then any pentad } (\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \textit{ satisfies the condition (2.4).} \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, if both $\mathfrak{g}$ and V are finite-dimensional, then any quadruplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ can be naturally regarded as a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k}), B_0)$.

Proof. The claim (2.5) is clear. Let us show the claim (2.6). If $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, then the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}$ can be identified with $\mathfrak{g}$. Precisely, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is finite-dimensional, then any linear map $f : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{k}$ corresponds to some element $A \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that

$$f(a) = B_0(a, A)$$

for any $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. Thus, for any $v \in V$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists an element of $\mathfrak{g}$ which corresponds to a linear map $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{k}$ defined by

$$a \mapsto \langle \rho(a \otimes v), \phi \rangle.$$

It means that the pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ has the Φ-map. ∎

Remark 2.4. If V is infinite-dimensional, then a submodule $\mathcal{V}$ of $\mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$ satisfying the condition (2.3) does not necessary coincide with $\mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$.

Remark 2.5. In general, a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and its module (ρ, V) might not have a $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{k})$ and a bilinear form B_0 such that a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is standard.

Example 2.6. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$, K be the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}] \otimes \mathfrak{g}$ be the loop algebra (see [4, Ch.7]). Let $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ be a bilinear form on $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ defined by:

$$K_{\mathcal{L}}(t^n \otimes X, t^m \otimes Y) := \delta_{n+m,0} K(X, Y).$$

Clearly, the bilinear form $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ is non-degenerate and invariant. Thus, we can regard $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ itself as a $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$-submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathbb{C})$ via the non-degenerate invariant bilinear form $K_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then, a pentad $(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{ad}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), K_{\mathcal{L}})$, where ad stands for the adjoint representation, is standard. In fact, we have the condition (2.3) clearly, and, we can identify the bracket product $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}) \times \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ with the Φ-map of $(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{ad}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), K_{\mathcal{L}})$, denoted by Φ^1_{ad}.

However, a pentad $(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{ad}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathbb{C}), K_{\mathcal{L}})$ is not standard since it does not have the Φ-map. In fact, if we assume that this pentad might have the Φ-map, denoted by Φ^2_{ad}, and put

$$H_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_0 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{g},$$
$$\phi_{Y_0} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathbb{C}), \quad \langle t^n \otimes X, \phi_{Y_0} \rangle := K(Y_0, X),$$

then an element $\Phi^2_{\mathrm{ad}}((1 \otimes X_0) \otimes \phi_{Y_0}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\mathcal{L}}(t^n \otimes H_0, \Phi^2_{\mathrm{ad}}((1 \otimes X_0) \otimes \phi_{Y_0})) &= \langle [t^n \otimes H_0, 1 \otimes X_0], \phi_{Y_0} \rangle \\ &= \langle t^n \otimes 2X_0, \phi_{Y_0} \rangle \\ &= K(Y_0, 2X_0) \\ &= 8 \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g})$ does not have an element satisfying (2.7) for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and, thus, the pentad $(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{ad}, \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathbb{C}), K_{\mathcal{L}})$ does not have the Φ-map.

On the Φ-map and Ψ-map of a standard pentad, we have similar properties to ones of the Φ-map and Ψ-map of a standard quadruplet (see [9]).

Proposition 2.7. *The Φ-map and the Ψ-map of a standard quadruplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ are homomorphisms of Lie modules. (cf. [9, Proposition 1.3]).*

Proof. We can prove it by the same way to [9, Proposition 1.3]. ∎

Definition 2.8. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad. For each element $v \in V$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$, we define linear maps $\Phi_{\rho,v} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathfrak{g})$ and $\Psi_{\rho,\phi} \in \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{g})$ by:

$$\Phi_{\rho,v}(\psi) := \Phi_\rho(v \otimes \psi), \quad \Psi_{\rho,\phi}(u) := \Psi_\rho(\phi \otimes u)$$

for any $u \in V$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, we define the following linear maps:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^\circ_\rho : V &\to \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{V}, \mathfrak{g}) & \Psi^\circ_\rho : \mathcal{V} &\to \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathfrak{g}) \\ v &\mapsto \Phi_{\rho,v}, & \phi &\mapsto \Psi_{\rho,\phi}. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify, we denote $\Phi_{\rho,v}(\psi)$ and $\Psi_{\rho,\phi}(u)$ by $v(\psi)$ and $\phi(u)$ respectively.

Definition 2.9. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad. Put $V_0 := \mathfrak{g}$, $V_1 := V$ and $V_{-1} := \mathcal{V}$ and denote the canonical representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on V_0 and $V_{\pm 1}$ by ρ_0 and $\rho_{\pm 1}$. We define homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules p_0 and q_0 by:

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 :& V_1 \otimes V_0 \to V_1 \\ & v_1 \otimes a \mapsto -\rho_1(a \otimes v_1), \\ q_0 :& V_{-1} \otimes V_0 \to V_{-1} \\ & \phi_{-1} \otimes b \mapsto -\rho_{-1}(b \otimes \phi_{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we define homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules p_1 and q_{-1} by:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 :& V_1 \otimes V_1 \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, V_1) \\ & v_1 \otimes u_1 \mapsto (\eta_{-1} \mapsto \rho_1(v_1(\eta_{-1}) \otimes u_1) - \rho_1(u_1(\eta_{-1}) \otimes v_1)), \\ q_{-1} :& V_{-1} \otimes V_{-1} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, V_{-1}) \\ & \phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-1} \mapsto (\xi_1 \mapsto \rho_{-1}(\phi_{-1}(\xi_1) \otimes \psi_{-1}) - \rho_{-1}(\psi_{-1}(\xi_1) \otimes \phi_{-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where $v_1(\eta_{-1}) \in V_0$ and $\phi_{-1}(\xi_1) \in V_0$ stand for $\Phi_{\rho,v_1}(\eta_{-1})$ and $\Psi_{\rho,\phi_{-1}}(\xi_1)$ respectively.

Moreover, suppose that $i \geq 2$ and there exist $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (ρ_{i-1}, V_{i-1}) and (ρ_{-i+1}, V_{-i+1}) and homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $p_{i-1} : V_1 \otimes V_{i-1} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, V_{i-1})$ and $q_{-i+1} : V_{-1} \otimes V_{-i+1} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, V_{-i+1})$. Then, we put $V_i := \mathrm{Im}\ p_{i-1}$, $V_{-i} := \mathrm{Im}\ q_{-i+1}$ and define linear maps p_i, q_{-i} by:

$$\begin{aligned} p_i :& V_1 \otimes V_i \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, V_i) \\ & v_1 \otimes u_i \mapsto (\eta_{-1} \mapsto \rho_i(v_1(\eta_{-1}) \otimes u_i) + p_{i-1}(v_1 \otimes u_i(\eta_{-1}))), \\ q_{-i} :& V_{-1} \otimes V_{-i} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, V_{-i}) \\ & \phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-i} \mapsto (\xi_1 \mapsto \rho_{-i}(\phi_{-1}(\xi_1) \otimes \psi_{-i}) + q_{-i+1}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-i}(\xi_1))), \end{aligned}$$

where $u_i(\eta_{-1}) \in V_{i-1}$ and $\psi_{-i}(\xi_1) \in V_{-i+1}$ are the images of η_{-1} and ξ_1 via u_i and ψ_{-i} respectively. Then, the linear maps p_i and q_{-i} are homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (cf. [9, Proposition 1.10]). We

denote the images of p_i and q_{-i} by V_{i+1} and V_{-i-1} and the canonical representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on V_{i+1} and V_{-i-1} by ρ_{i+1} and ρ_{-i-1} respectively. Thus, inductively, we obtain $\mathfrak{g}$-modules V_n and representations ρ_n of $\mathfrak{g}$ on V_n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We call V_n the *n-graduation* of $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$.

Remark 2.10. For any $v_1 \in V_1$ and $\phi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, we have

$$p_1(v_1 \otimes v_1)(\eta_{-1}) = \rho_1(v_1(\eta_{-1}) \otimes v_1) - \rho_1(v_1(\eta_{-1}) \otimes v_1) = 0,$$
$$q_{-1}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \phi_{-1})(\xi_1) = \rho_{-1}(\phi_{-1}(\xi_1) \otimes \phi_{-1}) - \rho_{-1}(\phi_{-1}(\xi_1) \otimes \phi_{-1}) = 0.$$

In general, we do not assume that ρ and ϱ are surjective, i.e. we do not assume that $V_1 = \operatorname{Im} p_0$ and $V_{-1} = \operatorname{Im} q_0$. In particular cases where these linear maps are surjective, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.11. *If $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes V \to V$ and $\varrho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ are surjective, then Φ_ρ° and Ψ_ρ° are injective, and, thus, V and $\mathcal{V}$ can be regarded as $\mathfrak{g}$-submodules of $\operatorname{Hom}(V_{-1}, V_0)$ and $\operatorname{Hom}(V_1, V_0)$ respectively.*

Proof. To show this proposition, we use the condition (2.3). Let us show that the linear map Φ_ρ° is injective. We take an arbitrary element $v \in V$ which satisfies that $\Phi_{\rho,v} = 0$. Then we have

$$0 = B_0(a, \Phi_{\rho,v}(\phi)) = \langle \rho(a \otimes v), \phi \rangle = -\langle v, \varrho(a \otimes \phi) \rangle \tag{2.8}$$

for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$. By the condition (2.3) and the assumption that ϱ is surjective, we have that $v = 0$. Therefore, we obtain that Φ_ρ° is injective. Similarly, we can show that Ψ_ρ° is injective. ∎

Definition 2.12. We define the following bilinear maps

$$[\cdot,\cdot]_n^0 : V_0 \times V_n \to V_n, \quad [\cdot,\cdot]_n^1 : V_1 \times V_n \to V_{n+1}, \quad [\cdot,\cdot]_n^{-1} : V_{-1} \times V_n \to V_{n-1}$$

by:

$$[a_0, z_n]_n^0 := \rho_n(a_0 \otimes z_n),$$

$$[x_1, z_n]_n^1 := \begin{cases} p_n(x_1 \otimes z_n) & (n \geq 0) \\ -z_n(x_1) & (n \leq -1) \end{cases},$$

$$[y_{-1}, z_n]_n^{-1} := \begin{cases} -z_n(y_{-1}) & (n \geq 1) \\ q_n(y_{-1} \otimes z_n) & (n \leq 0) \end{cases}$$

where $a_0 \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $z_n \in V_n$. Note that $z_n(x_1)$ stands for $\Psi_{\rho,z_{-1}}(x_1)$ when $n = -1$ and the image of x_1 via $z_n \in \operatorname{Hom}(V_1, V_{n+1})$ when $n \leq -2$. Moreover, for $i \geq 1$, we define the following bilinear maps

$$[\cdot,\cdot]_n^{i+1} : V_{i+1} \times V_n \to V_{i+n+1}, \quad [\cdot,\cdot]_n^{-i-1} : V_{-i-1} \times V_n \to V_{-i+n-1}$$

by:

$$[p_i(x_1 \otimes z_i), w_n]_n^{i+1} := [x_1, [z_i, w_n]_n^i]_{i+n}^1 - [z_i, [x_1, w_n]_n^1]_{n+1}^i \tag{2.9}$$
$$(x_1 \in V_1, z_i \in V_i, w_n \in V_n)$$

and

$$[q_{-i}(y_{-1} \otimes \omega_{-i}), w_n]_n^{-i-1} := [y_{-1}, [\omega_{-i}, w_n]_n^{-i}]_{-i+n}^{-1} - [\omega_{-i}, [y_{-1}, w_n]_n^{-1}]_{n-1}^{-i} \tag{2.10}$$
$$(y_{-1} \in V_{-1}, \omega_{-i} \in V_{-i}, w_n \in V_n)$$

inductively. Then the bilinear maps (2.9) and (2.10) are well-defined. It can be shown by the same argument to the argument of [9, Propositions 2.5 and 2.6]. Consequently, we can define a bilinear map $[\cdot,\cdot]_m^n : V_n \times V_m \to V_{n+m}$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 2.13. For a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, we denote a direct sum of its n-graduations by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, i.e.

$$L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n.$$

Moreover, we define a bilinear map $[\cdot,\cdot] : L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \times L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \to L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ by

$$[x_n, y_m] := [x_n, y_m]_m^n \tag{2.11}$$

for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_n \in V_n$ and $y_m \in V_m$.

Proposition 2.14. *This bilinear map $[\cdot,\cdot]$ satisfies the following equations*

$$[x, y] + [y, x] = 0, \tag{2.12}$$
$$[x, [y, z]] + [z, [x, y]] + [y, [z, x]] = 0 \tag{2.13}$$

for any $x, y, z \in L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$.

Proof. We can prove it by the same argument to the argument of [9, Propositions 2.9 and 2.10]. ∎

As a corollary of Proposition 2.14, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.15 (Lie algebra associated with a standard pentad)**.** *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad over a field $\mathfrak{k}$. Then the vector space $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n$ is a graded Lie algebra with a bracket product $[\cdot,\cdot]$ defined in Definition 2.13. We call this graded Lie algebra* the Lie algebra associated with $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ *(cf. [9, Theorem 2.11]).*

Proof. If the characteristic of $\mathfrak{k}$ is not 2, our claim follows from Proposition 2.14 immediately.

Assume that the characteristic of $\mathfrak{k}$ is 2. To prove our claim, it is sufficient to show that the bilinear form $[\cdot,\cdot]$ satisfies the equation

$$[x,x]=0 \tag{2.14}$$

for any $x \in L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$. Let us show the equation (2.14) for the cases where $x=x_n \in V_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $n=0$, the restriction of $[\cdot,\cdot] : L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)\times L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0) \to L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ to $V_0 \times V_0$ coincides with the bracket product of $\mathfrak{g}$. Thus we have $[x_0,x_0]=0$ for any $x_0 \in V_0$. For $n \geq 1$, by Proposition 2.14, we have

$$[[x_n,x_n],\phi_{-1}] = [[x_n,\phi_{-1}],x_n] + [x_n,[x_n,\phi_{-1}]] = 0 \tag{2.15}$$

for any $\phi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $x_n \in V_n$. Thus, we have the equation $[x_n,x_n]=0$ in $V_{2n}=\mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1},V_{2n-1})$ for any $x_n \in V_n$. Similarly, we have the same equation $[x_n,x_n]=0$ for any $n \leq -1$ and $x_n \in V_n$. Therefore, we have the equation (2.14) for the cases where $x=x_n \in V_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Now, we take an arbitrary element $x \in L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$. There exist integers $n_1,\ldots,n_k$ and elements $x_{n_1} \in V_{n_1},\ldots,x_{n_k} \in V_{n_k}$ such that $x=x_{n_1}+\cdots+x_{n_k}$. Then we have

$$[x,x] = [x_{n_1}+\cdots+x_{n_k},x_{n_1}+\cdots+x_{n_k}] = \sum_{i=1}^{k}[x_{n_i},x_{n_i}] + \sum_{i\neq j}\Big([x_{n_i},x_{n_j}]+[x_{n_j},x_{n_i}]\Big) = 0.$$

Thus we have the equation (2.14) for any $x \in L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$. This completes the proof. ∎

Remark 2.16. Note that we can prove Theorem 2.15 without the assumption that the bilinear form B_0 is symmetric.

Note that $V_0=\mathfrak{g}$ and that the V_0-modules V_0, V_1, V_{-1} are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}$, V, $\mathcal{V}$ respectively. In this sense, we can say that the objects $\mathfrak{g}$, (ρ,V), $(\varrho,\mathcal{V})$ can be embedded into $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$.

In particular, when ρ and ϱ are faithful and surjective, we have a similar result on the structure of a graded Lie algebra of the form $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ to the result which is obtained by H. Rubenthaler in [8, Proposition 3.4.2]. We can show the following proposition by Proposition 2.11 immediately.

Proposition 2.17. *Let $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ be a standard pentad. If both $\rho : \mathfrak{g}\otimes V \to V$ and $\varrho : \mathfrak{g}\otimes\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ are faithful and surjective, then the graded Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is transitive.*

2.2 Standard pentads with a symmetric bilinear form

In the previous section, we proved that for any standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$, there exists a graded Lie algebra such that $\mathfrak{g}$, ρ, V and $\mathcal{V}$ can be embedded into it. In this section, we discuss cases where B_0 is symmetric. In these cases, we can also embed B_0 into $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ and we can obtain some useful properties.

Proposition 2.18. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad such that B_0 is symmetric. We define a symmetric bilinear form B_L on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ inductively as follows:*

$$\begin{cases} B_L(a,b) = B_0(a,b), \\ B_L(v,\phi) = \langle v, \phi \rangle, \\ B_L(p_i(v_1 \otimes u_i), q_{-i}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-i})) = B_L(u_i, [q_{-i}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-i}), v_1]), \\ B_L(x_n, y_m) = 0 \end{cases}$$

for any $a, b \in V_0$, $v \in V$, $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$, $i \geq 1$, $v_1 \in V_1$, $\phi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $u_i \in V_i$, $\psi_{-i} \in V_{-i}$, $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n + m \neq 0$, $x_n \in V_n$ and $y_m \in V_m$. Then B_L is a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ (cf. [9, Proposition 3.2]).

Proof. Note that it is clear that the restriction of B_L to $V_0 \times V_0$ and $V_1 \times V_{-1}$ is well-defined. Let us show the well-definedness of B_L on $V_2 \times V_{-2}$. For any $v_1, u_1 \in V_1$ and $\phi_{-1}, \psi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_L(u_1, [q_{-1}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-1}), v_1]) = B_L(u_1, [[\phi_{-1}, v_1], \psi_{-1}] + [\phi_{-1}, [\psi_{-1}, v_1]]) \\ &\quad = \langle u_1, [[\phi_{-1}, v_1], \psi_{-1}] + [\phi_{-1}, [\psi_{-1}, v_1]] \rangle \\ &\quad = B_0([\phi_{-1}, v_1], \psi_{-1}(u_1)) - B_0([\psi_{-1}, v_1], \phi_{-1}(u_1)) \\ &\quad = B_0([\phi_{-1}, v_1], \psi_{-1}(u_1)) - B_0(\phi_{-1}(u_1), [\psi_{-1}, v_1]) \quad \text{(by the assumption that } B_0 \text{ is symmetric)} \\ &\quad = B_0([v_1, \phi_{-1}], u_1(\psi_{-1})) - B_0(u_1(\phi_{-1}), [v_1, \psi_{-1}]) \\ &\quad = \langle [[v_1, \phi_{-1}], u_1] + [v_1, [u_1, \phi_{-1}]], \psi_{-1} \rangle \\ &\quad = B_L([p_1(v_1 \otimes u_1), \phi_{-1}], \psi_{-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Thus, if $v_1^1, \ldots, v_1^l, u_1^1, \ldots, u_1^l \in V_1$ and $\phi_{-1}^1, \ldots, \phi_{-1}^k, \psi_{-1}^1, \ldots, \psi_{-1}^k \in V_{-1}$ satisfy the equation

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} p_1(v_1^s \otimes u_1^s) = 0, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{k} q_{-1}(\phi_{-1}^t \otimes \psi_{-1}^t) = 0,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s=1}^{l} B_L(u_1^s, [q_{-1}(\phi_{-1} \otimes \psi_{-1}), v_1^s]) = \sum_{s=1}^{l} B_L([p_1(v_1^s \otimes u_1^s), \phi_{-1}], \psi_{-1}) = 0, \\ &\sum_{t=1}^{k} B_L(u_1, [q_{-1}(\phi_{-1}^t \otimes \psi_{-1}^t), v_1]) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $v_1, u_1 \in V_1$ and $\phi_{-1}, \psi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, that is, we have the well-definedness of B_L on $V_2 \times V_{-2}$. This $B_L \mid_{V_2 \times V_{-2}}$ is $\mathfrak{g}$-invariant. Moreover, by a similar argument, we have the well-definedness of B_L on $V_i \times V_{-i}$ for each $i \geq 3$ by induction (see [9, section 1.2]). Consequently, we can show the well-definedness of B_L on the whole $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and that B_L is non-degenerate symmetric invariant by the same argument as the argument in [9, section 1.2 and Proposition 3.2]. ∎

Remark 2.19. We need the assumption that B_0 is symmetric to show that the bilinear form B_L is $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-invariant. Precisely, we need this assumption to show an equation

$$B_L(v_1, [\phi_{-1}, a]) = B_L([v_1, \phi_{-1}], a)$$

for any $a \in V_0$, $v_1 \in V_1$, $\phi_{-1} \in V_{-1}$.

Under the assumption that B_0 is symmetric, the graded Lie algebra is characterized by the existence of such a bilinear form. The following is a proposition concerning the "universality" and "uniqueness" of Lie algebras associated with a standard pentad with a symmetric bilinear form.

Theorem 2.20. *Let $\mathfrak{L} = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{L}_n$ be a graded Lie algebra which has a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form $B_{\mathfrak{L}}$. If $\mathfrak{L}$ and $B_{\mathfrak{L}}$ satisfy the following conditions, then a pentad $(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$ is standard and $\mathfrak{L}$ is isomorphic to $L(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$:*

$$\mathfrak{L}_{i+1} = [\mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_i],\ \mathfrak{L}_{-i-1} = [\mathfrak{L}_{-1}, \mathfrak{L}_{-i}] \text{ for all } i \geq 1, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\text{the restriction of } B_{\mathfrak{L}} \text{ to } \mathfrak{L}_i \times \mathfrak{L}_{-i} \text{ is non-degenerate for any } i \geq 0, \tag{2.18}$$

where ad *stands for the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{L}$ on itself (cf. [9, Proposition 3.3]).*

Proof. First of all, let us check that the pentad $(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$ is standard. By (2.18), we can obtain that $B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0}$ is non-degenerate and that $\mathfrak{L}_1$ and $\mathfrak{L}_{-1}$ satisfy the condition (2.3). It is easy to show that we can identify the restriction of the bracket product $[\cdot,\cdot]$ of $\mathfrak{L}$ to $\mathfrak{L}_1 \times \mathfrak{L}_{-1} \to \mathfrak{L}_0$ with the Φ-map of the pentad $(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$. Thus, the condition (2.4) holds.

We denote the n-graduation of $(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$ by $(\mathfrak{L})_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a bilinear form on $L(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0\times\mathfrak{L}_0})$ obtained in Proposition 2.18 by $(B)_{\mathfrak{L}}$. Let $\sigma_0 : (\mathfrak{L})_0 \to \mathfrak{L}_0$ and $\sigma_{\pm1} : (\mathfrak{L})_{\pm1} \to \mathfrak{L}_{\pm1}$ be the identity maps respectively. Then the linear maps σ_0 and $\sigma_{\pm1}$ satisfy the following equations:

$$[\sigma_0(a), \sigma_{\pm1}(x_{\pm1})] = \sigma_{\pm1}([a, x_{\pm1}]), \tag{2.19}$$

$$[\sigma_1(x_1), \sigma_{-1}(x_{-1})] = \sigma_0([x_1, x_{-1}]) \tag{2.20}$$

for any $a \in (\mathfrak{L})_0$ and $x_{\pm1} \in (\mathfrak{L})_{\pm1}$. Indeed, the equation (2.19) is clear, and, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_{\mathfrak{L}}(\sigma_0(b), [\sigma_1(x_1), \sigma_{-1}(x_{-1})]) = B_{\mathfrak{L}}([\sigma_0(b), \sigma_1(x_1)], \sigma_{-1}(x_{-1})) = B_{\mathfrak{L}}(\sigma_1([b, x_1]), \sigma_{-1}(x_{-1})) \\ &\quad = (B)_{\mathfrak{L}}([b, x_1], x_{-1}) = (B)_{\mathfrak{L}}(b, [x_1, x_{-1}]) = B_{\mathfrak{L}}(\sigma_0(b), \sigma_0([x_1, x_{-1}])) \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

for any $b \in (\mathfrak{L})_0$. Thus, we can obtain the equation (2.20).

For each $i \geq 1$, we define linear maps $\sigma_{i+1} : (\mathfrak{L})_{i+1} \to \mathfrak{L}_{i+1}$ and $\sigma_{-i-1} : (\mathfrak{L})_{-i-1} \to \mathfrak{L}_{-i-1}$ by:

$$\sigma_{i+1} : p_i(x_1 \otimes z_i) \mapsto [\sigma_1(x_1), \sigma_i(z_i)], \tag{2.22}$$

$$\sigma_{-i-1} : q_{-i}(x_{-1} \otimes z_{-i}) \mapsto [\sigma_{-1}(x_{-1}), \sigma_{-i}(z_{-i})] \tag{2.23}$$

for any $x_{\pm 1} \in (\mathfrak{L})_{\pm 1}$ and $z_{\pm i} \in (\mathfrak{L})_{\pm i}$ inductively. Note that it follows from (2.19) that the linear maps σ_1 and σ_{-1} on $\rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V)$ and $\varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V})$ defined by the same equations as (2.22) and (2.23) where $i = 0$ coincide with the identity maps respectively. We can prove that the linear maps σ_n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$) are well-defined and satisfy

$$[\sigma_0(a), \sigma_n(z_n)] = \sigma_n([a, z_n]), \tag{2.24}$$

$$[\sigma_{\pm 1}(x_{\pm 1}), \sigma_n(z_n)] = \sigma_{n \pm 1}([x_{\pm 1}, z_n]) \tag{2.25}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \in (\mathfrak{L})_0$, $x_{\pm 1} \in (\mathfrak{L})_{\pm 1}$ and $z_n \in (\mathfrak{L})_n$ by a similar argument to the argument of [9, Proposition 3.3]. Then a linear map $\sigma : L(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0 \times \mathfrak{L}_0}) \to \mathfrak{L}$ defined by

$$\sigma(z_n) := \sigma_n(z_n), \tag{2.26}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $z_n \in (\mathfrak{L})_n \subset L(\mathfrak{L}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{L}_1, \mathfrak{L}_{-1}, B_{\mathfrak{L}} \mid_{\mathfrak{L}_0 \times \mathfrak{L}_0})$, is an isomorphism of Lie algebras. We can also prove this by a similar argument to the argument of [9, Proposition 3.3]. ∎

As a corollary of Theorem 2.20, we can say that the theory of standard pentads is an extension of the theory of standard quadruplets.

Proposition 2.21. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ be a standard quadruplet (see [9, Definition 1.9]). Then the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ associated with $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, B_0)$ (see [9, Theorem 2.11]) is isomorphic to the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}), B_0)$.*

Definition 2.22. Let $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ be standard pentads. We say that these pentads are *equivalent* if and only if there exists an isomorphism of Lie algebras $\tau : \mathfrak{g}^1 \to \mathfrak{g}^2$, linear isomorphisms $\sigma : V^1 \to V^2$, $\varsigma : \mathcal{V}^1 \to \mathcal{V}^2$ and a non-zero element $c \in \mathfrak{k}$ such that

$$\sigma(\rho^1(a^1 \otimes x^1)) = \rho^2(\tau(a^1) \otimes \sigma(x^1)), \tag{2.27}$$

$$\varsigma(\varrho^1(a^1 \otimes y^1)) = \varrho^2(\tau(a^1) \otimes \varsigma(y^1)), \tag{2.28}$$

$$\langle x^1, y^1 \rangle^1 = \langle \sigma(x^1), \varsigma(y^1) \rangle^2, \tag{2.29}$$

$$B_0^1(a^1, b^1) = c B_0^2(\tau(a^1), \tau(b^1)) \tag{2.30}$$

where $a^1, b^1 \in \mathfrak{g}^1$, $x^1 \in V^1$, $y^1 \in \mathcal{V}^1$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^i$ stands for the pairing between V^i and $\mathcal{V}^i$ ($i = 1, 2$). We denote this equivalence relation by

$$(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \simeq (\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2). \tag{2.31}$$

Remark 2.23. Note that if V is finite-dimensional, then linear isomorphisms τ, σ satisfying (2.27) induce a linear isomorphism from $\mathcal{V}^1 = \mathrm{Hom}(V^1, \mathfrak{k})$ to $\mathcal{V}^2 = \mathrm{Hom}(V^2, \mathfrak{k})$ satisfying (2.28) and (2.29).

Proposition 2.24. *If standard pentads* $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ *and* $(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ *are equivalent, then the Lie algebras associated with them are isomorphic, i.e. we have*

$$L(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \simeq L(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2) \tag{2.32}$$

(cf. [9, Proposition 3.6]).

Proof. We denote the n-graduation of $(\mathfrak{g}^i, \rho^i, V^i, \mathcal{V}^i, B_0^i)$ by V_n^i $(i = 1, 2)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the bilinear forms on $L(\mathfrak{g}^i, \rho^i, V^i, \mathcal{V}^i, B_0^i)$ defined in Proposition 2.18 by B_L^i $(i = 1, 2)$. Under the notation of Definition 2.22, we define linear maps $\sigma_0 := \tau : V_0^1 \to V_0^2$, $\sigma_1 := \frac{1}{c}\sigma : V_1^1 \to V_1^2$ and $\sigma_{-1} := \varsigma : V_{-1}^1 \to V_{-1}^2$. Then, these linear maps σ_0 and $\sigma_{\pm 1}$ satisfy the same equations as (2.19) and (2.20). In fact, the equation (2.19) is clear, and, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_0^2(\sigma_0(a_0^1), [\sigma_1(x_1^1), \sigma_{-1}(y_{-1}^1)]) = B_L^2(\sigma_1([a_0^1, x_1^1]), \sigma_{-1}(y_{-1}^1)) \\ &\quad = \frac{1}{c} B_L^1([a_0^1, x_1^1], y_{-1}^1) = \frac{1}{c} B_0^1(a_0^1, [x_1^1, y_{-1}^1]) = B_0^2(\sigma_0(a_0^1), \sigma_0([x_1^1, y_{-1}^1])) \end{aligned}$$

for any $a_0^1 \in V_0^1$, $x_1^1 \in V_1^1$ and $y_{-1}^1 \in V_{-1}^1$. Thus, we have the equation (2.20). Then, by the same argument as the argument in proof of Theorem 2.20, we can construct an isomorphism of Lie algebras from $L(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ to $L(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$. ∎

Remark 2.25. The converse of Proposition 2.22 is not true. In fact, we have an example of two non-equivalent pentads such that the corresponding Lie algebras are isomorphic (see [9, pp. 398–399]).

Definition 2.26. Let $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ be standard pentads. Let $\rho^1 \boxplus \rho^2$ and $\varrho^1 \boxplus \varrho^2$ be representations of $\mathfrak{g}^1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}^2$ on $V^1 \oplus V^2$ and $\mathcal{V}^1 \oplus \mathcal{V}^2$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\rho^1 \boxplus \rho^2)((a^1, a^2) \otimes (v^1, v^2)) := (\rho^1(a^1 \otimes v^1), \rho^2(a^2 \otimes v^2)), \\ &(\varrho^1 \boxplus \varrho^2)((b^1, b^2) \otimes (\phi^1, \phi^2)) := (\varrho^1(b^1 \otimes \phi^1), \varrho^2(b^2 \otimes \phi^2)) \end{aligned}$$

where $a^i, b^i \in \mathfrak{g}^i$, $v^i \in V^i$, $\phi^i \in \mathcal{V}^i$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Let $B_0^1 \oplus B_0^2$ be a bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}^1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}^2$ defined by:

$$(B_0^1 \oplus B_0^2)((a^1, a^2), (b^1, b^2)) := B_0^1(a^1, b^1) + B_0^2(a^2, b^2) \tag{2.33}$$

where $a^i, b^i \in \mathfrak{g}^i$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Then, clearly, a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}^1 \oplus \mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^1 \boxplus \rho^2, V^1 \oplus V^2, \mathcal{V}^1 \oplus \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^1 \oplus B_0^2)$ is also a standard pentad. We call it a *direct sum* of $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ and denote it by $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \oplus (\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$.

Proposition 2.27. *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1)$ *and* $(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ *be standard pentads. Then the Lie algebra* $L((\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \oplus (\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2))$ *is isomorphic to* $L(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \oplus L(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$ *(cf. [9, Proposition 3.9]).*

Proof. We retain to use the notation of Proposition 2.24. Then, we have the following $\mathbb{Z}$-grading of $L(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \oplus L(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2)$:

$$L(\mathfrak{g}^1, \rho^1, V^1, \mathcal{V}^1, B_0^1) \oplus L(\mathfrak{g}^2, \rho^2, V^2, \mathcal{V}^2, B_0^2) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (V_n^1 \oplus V_n^2). \tag{2.34}$$

By Theorem 2.20, we have our claim. ∎

Definition 2.28. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad. We say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is *decomposable* if and only if there exist standard pentads $(\mathfrak{a}, \rho_\mathfrak{a}, V_\mathfrak{a}, \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}, B_{0,\mathfrak{a}})$ and $(\mathfrak{b}, \rho_\mathfrak{b}, V_\mathfrak{b}, \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{b}, B_{0,\mathfrak{b}})$ such that

$$(\dim \mathfrak{a} + \dim V_\mathfrak{a})(\dim \mathfrak{b} + \dim V_\mathfrak{b}) \neq 0, \tag{2.35}$$

$$(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \simeq (\mathfrak{a}, \rho_\mathfrak{a}, V_\mathfrak{a}, \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}, B_{0,\mathfrak{a}}) \oplus (\mathfrak{b}, \rho_\mathfrak{b}, V_\mathfrak{b}, \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{b}, B_{0,\mathfrak{b}}). \tag{2.36}$$

If $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is not decomposable, we say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is *indecomposable*.

Definition 2.29. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad. We say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is *reducible* if and only if there exist an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$-submodules $V_\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}$ of V and $\mathcal{V}$ satisfying that:

$$\{0\} \neq \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus V_\mathfrak{a} \subsetneq \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus V, \tag{2.37}$$

$$\rho(\mathfrak{a} \otimes V), \rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V_\mathfrak{a}) \subset V_\mathfrak{a} \text{ and } \varrho(\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathcal{V}), \varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}) \subset \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}, \tag{2.38}$$

$$\Phi_\rho(V_\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathcal{V}), \Phi_\rho(V \otimes \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}) \subset \mathfrak{a}. \tag{2.39}$$

And, we say that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is *irreducible* if and only if it is not reducible.

Remark 2.30. If a standard pentad is irreducible, then it is indecomposable.

Proposition 2.31. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be an irreducible standard pentad. Then the representations $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes V \to V$, $\varrho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ and the Φ-map $\Phi_\rho : V \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathfrak{g}$ are surjective.*

Proof. If $\varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \Phi_\rho(V \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V) = \{0\}$, it follows that $\dim \mathcal{V} = \dim \mathfrak{g} = \dim V = 0$ from the assumption that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is irreducible. In particular, we have $\varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{V} = \{0\}$ and $\rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V) = V = \{0\}$. If $\varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \Phi_\rho(V \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V) \neq \{0\}$, since it satisfies the conditions (2.38) and (2.39), we have $\varrho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \Phi_\rho(V \otimes \mathcal{V}) \oplus \rho(\mathfrak{g} \otimes V) = \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$. ∎

Proposition 2.32. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be an irreducible standard pentad whose representation ρ is faithful and denote the Lie algebra associated with it by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} V_n$. Let N (respectively M) be an integer such that V_{N+1} is not $\{0\}$ (respectively V_{-M-1} is not $\{0\}$). Then for any non-zero element $z_N \in V_N$ (respectively $\omega_{-M} \in V_{-M}$), there exists an element $x_1 \in V_1$ such that $[x_1, z_N] \neq 0$ (respectively $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ such that $[y_{-1}, \omega_{-M}] \neq 0$) (cf. [9, Proposition 3.11]).*

Proof. When $N \leq -1$, we have our claim by Propositions 2.11, 2.17 and 2.31. When $N = 0$, we have our claim by the assumption that ρ is faithful. Assume that $N \geq 1$ and $V_{N+1} \neq \{0\}$ and put $\mathfrak{a}_N := \{a_N \in V_N \mid [x_1, a_N] = 0 \text{ for any } x_1 \in V_1\}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_n := \{a_n \in V_n \mid [x_1, a_n] \in \mathfrak{a}_{n+1} \text{ for any } x_1 \in V_1\}$ for $n \leq N-1$ inductively. Then $\mathfrak{a}_n$ is a V_0-submodule of V_n for each n, i.e. $[V_0, \mathfrak{a}_n] \subset \mathfrak{a}_n$, and, we have that $[V_{\pm 1}, \mathfrak{a}_n] \subset \mathfrak{a}_{n\pm 1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see [9, the proof of Proposition 3.11]). In particular, $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1$ satisfies the conditions (2.38) and (2.39). If $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$, then we have $\mathfrak{a}_N = V_N$ and a contradiction to the assumption that $V_{N+1} \neq \{0\}$. Thus we have $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \{0\}$, and, thus, $\mathfrak{a}_2 = \{0\}, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_N = \{0\}$ by the transitivity of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. Similarly, we have our result for M such that $V_{-M-1} \neq \{0\}$. ∎

Proposition 2.33. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be an irreducible standard pentad whose representation ρ is faithful. If the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is finite-dimensional, then $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is simple (cf. [9, Proposition 3.12]). Moreover, if $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is defined over $\mathbb{C}$ and $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra, then a triplet $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V)$ corresponds to some prehomogeneous vector space of parabolic type (see [9, Theorem 3.13]).*

Proof. We can show this by Proposition 2.32 and the same argument to the argument of [9, Proposition 3.12 and Theorem 3.13]. ∎

A prehomogeneous vector space of parabolic type (abbrev. a PV of parabolic type) is a PV which can be obtained from a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra. PVs of parabolic type are classified by H. Rubenthaler (see [5, 6, 7]).

Example 2.34. Let $m \geq 2$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_1(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_m(\mathbb{C})$, $\rho = \Lambda_1$ a representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on $\mathbb{C}^m$ defined by

$$\Lambda_1((a, A) \otimes v) := av + Av \quad (a \in \mathfrak{gl}_1, A \in \mathfrak{sl}_m, v \in V),$$

$B_0 = \kappa_m$ a bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\kappa_m((a, A), (a', A')) := \frac{m}{m+1} aa' + \mathrm{Tr}(AA') \quad (a, a' \in \mathfrak{gl}_1, A, A' \in \mathfrak{sl}_m).$$

Then, a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}), B_0) = (\mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_m, \Lambda_1, \mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^m, \kappa_m)$ is a standard pentad which has a $(m^2 + 2m)$-dimensional graded simple Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_m, \Lambda_1, \mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^m, \kappa_m) = V_{-1} \oplus V_0 \oplus V_1$ (see [9, Example 1.14]). This Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_m, \Lambda_1, \mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^m, \kappa_m)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_{m+1}$. Indeed, from the classification of PVs of parabolic type (see [5, 6, 7]) and the dimension of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathrm{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}), B_0)$, it is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_{m+1}$.

Example 2.35. Put $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_1(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_1(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$, $V := \mathbb{C}^2 = M(2, 1; \mathbb{C})$, $\mathcal{V} := \mathbb{C}^2$ and define representations $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes V \to V$, $\varrho : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ by:

$$\rho((a, b, A) \otimes v) := bv + Av, \quad \varrho((a, b, A) \otimes \phi) := -b\phi - {}^t A\phi$$

for any $(a,b,A) \in \mathfrak{g}$, $v \in V$, $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$. We can identify $\mathcal{V}$ with $\mathrm{Hom}(V,\mathbb{C})$ via the following bilinear map $\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle_V : V \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by:

$$\langle v,\phi \rangle_V := {}^t v\phi.$$

Let B_0 be a bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by:

$$B_0((a,b,A),(a',b',A')) := \frac{3}{4}aa' + bb' + \frac{1}{2}(ab' + a'b) + \mathrm{Tr}(AA').$$

Then, a pentad $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is a standard pentad whose Φ-map is given by:

$$\Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi) = (-{}^t v\phi, \frac{3}{2}{}^t v\phi, v^t\phi - \frac{1}{2}{}^t v\phi I_2).$$

The Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_3$. Indeed, if we put $\mathfrak{g}_V^1 := \mathbb{C} \cdot (1,0,O_2)$, $\mathfrak{g}_V^2 := \mathbb{C} \cdot (-\frac{2}{3},1,O_2) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0) &\simeq L((\mathfrak{g}_V^1,\rho\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^1},\{0\},\{0\},B_0\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^1\times\mathfrak{g}_V^1}) \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_V^2,\rho\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2},V,\mathcal{V},B_0\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2\times\mathfrak{g}_V^2})) \\ &\simeq \mathfrak{g}_V^1 \oplus L(\mathfrak{g}_V^2,\rho\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2},V,\mathcal{V},B_0\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2\times\mathfrak{g}_V^2}) \simeq \mathfrak{g}_V^1 \oplus \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_V^2 \oplus V \\ &\simeq \mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_3 \end{aligned}$$

from Example 2.34. Moreover, under this identification, the bilinear form B_L on $L(\mathfrak{g}_V^2,\rho\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2},V,\mathcal{V},B_0\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2\times\mathfrak{g}_V^2})$ is given by $B_L(\hat{A},\hat{A}') = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{A}\hat{A}')$ $(\hat{A},\hat{A}' \in \mathfrak{sl}_3)$. In fact, if we put

$$h := (0,0,\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}) \in \mathfrak{g}_V^2,$$

then $B_0(h,h) = 2$. On the other hand, we can obtain $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{ad}\ h\ \mathrm{ad}\ h) = 12$, where ad stands for the adjoint representation of $L(\mathfrak{g}_V^2,\rho\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2},V,\mathcal{V},B_0\mid_{\mathfrak{g}_V^2\times\mathfrak{g}_V^2})$, by a direct calculation. Since any non-degenerate invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ is a scalar multiple of the Killing form, we can obtain that B_L is 1/6 times the Killing form of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$, i.e. $B_L(\hat{A},\hat{A}') = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{A}\hat{A}')$.

Proposition 2.36. *Let $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ be a standard pentad whose representation ρ is faithful. Under this assumption, the pentad $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is irreducible if and only if the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ does not have a non-zero proper graded ideal.*

Proof. Assume that $(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is reducible. Under the notation of Definition 2.29, we put $\mathfrak{a}_{-1} := \mathcal{V}_\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{a}_0 := \mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{a}_1 := V_\mathfrak{a}$. Moreover, we put $\mathfrak{a}_n := [V_1,\mathfrak{a}_{n-1}]$ for all $n \geq 2$ and $\mathfrak{a}_m := [V_{-1},\mathfrak{a}_{m+1}]$ for all $m \leq -2$ inductively. Then a direct sum $\mathfrak{A} := \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{a}_n$ is a non-zero proper graded ideal of $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$. In fact, by the assumption that $[V_i,\mathfrak{a}_j] \subset \mathfrak{a}_{i+j}$ for any $-1 \leq i,j,i+j \leq 1$, we can easily show that $[V_0,\mathfrak{A}],[V_{\pm1},\mathfrak{A}] \subset \mathfrak{A}$ by induction. Since $L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$ is generated by V_0 and $V_{\pm1}$, we have $[L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0),\mathfrak{A}] \subset \mathfrak{A}$. Thus, $\mathfrak{A}$ is a graded ideal. Since $\{0\} \neq \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathfrak{g} \oplus V$, we have $\{0\} \neq \mathfrak{A} \subsetneq L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$.

Conversely, assume that $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is irreducible. Let $\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}(\mathfrak{b} \cap V_n)$ be a non-zero graded ideal of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and put $\mathfrak{b}_n := \mathfrak{b} \cap V_n$. Then, by Proposition 2.32, we can obtain that $\mathfrak{b}_0 \neq \{0\}$. In fact, since $\mathfrak{b} \neq \{0\}$, there exists an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a non-zero element $z_n \in \mathfrak{b}_n$. For example, if $n \geq 1$, then there exist n elements $y^1_{-1}, \ldots, y^n_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ such that $[y^n_{-1}, [\cdots [y^1_{-1}, z_n] \cdots]] \in \mathfrak{b}_0 \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\mathfrak{b}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{b}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{b}_1$ satisfies the conditions (2.38) and (2.39), it coincides with $V_{-1} \oplus V_0 \oplus V_1$, and, thus, $\mathfrak{b} = L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. ∎

The following lemmas are to construct a derivation on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. They are used in Theorem 3.26.

Lemma 2.37. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad, $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} V_n$ be the Lie algebra associated with it. Let $\alpha_i : V_i \to V_i$ $(i = 0, \pm 1)$ be linear maps which satisfy*

$$\alpha_{i+j}([a_i, b_j]) = [\alpha_i(a_i), b_j] + [a_i, \alpha_j(b_j)] \tag{2.40}$$

for any $-1 \leq i, j, i + j \leq 1$ and elements $a_i \in V_i$, $b_j \in V_j$. Then, there exists a linear map $\alpha : L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \to L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ such that α is a derivation on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and its restriction to V_i $(i = 0, \pm 1)$ coincides with α_i.

Proof. First, let us construct linear maps $\alpha_i : V_i \to V_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ by induction. Let $i \geq 1$ and assume that the integer i satisfies the condition that we have linear maps $\alpha_j : V_j \to V_j$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i$ which satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_j([a_0, b_j]) = [\alpha_0(a_0), b_j] + [a_0, \alpha_j(b_j)],\\
&\alpha_j([x_1, b_{j-1}]) = [\alpha_1(x_1), b_{j-1}] + [x_1, \alpha_{j-1}(b_{j-1})],\\
&\alpha_{j-1}([y_{-1}, b_j]) = [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), b_j] + [y_{-1}, \alpha_j(b_j)]
\end{aligned}$$

for any $0 \leq j \leq i$, $a_0 \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $b_j \in V_j$ and $b_{j-1} \in V_{j-1}$. By the assumption (2.40), when $i = 1$ the given linear maps α_0, $\alpha_{\pm 1}$ satisfy these equations. Then we define a linear map $\alpha_{i+1} : V_{i+1} \to V_{i+1}$ by:

$$\alpha_{i+1}([x_1, b_i]) := [\alpha_1(x_1), b_i] + [x_1, \alpha_i(b_i)] \tag{2.41}$$

for any $x_1 \in V_1$ and $b_i \in V_i$. Let us check the well-definedness of α_{i+1}. In fact, for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $x_1 \in V_1$ and $b_i \in V_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&[y_{-1}, [\alpha_1(x_1), b_i] + [x_1, \alpha_i(b_i)]] = [y_{-1}, [\alpha_1(x_1), b_i]] + [y_{-1}, [x_1, \alpha_i(b_i)]]\\
&\quad = [[y_{-1}, \alpha_1(x_1)], b_i] + [\alpha_1(x_1), [y_{-1}, b_i]] + [[y_{-1}, x_1], \alpha_i(b_i)] + [x_1, [y_{-1}, \alpha_i(b_i)]]\\
&\quad = [\alpha_0([y_{-1}, x_1]), b_i] - [[\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), x_1], b_i] + [\alpha_1(x_1), [y_{-1}, b_i]]\\
&\qquad + [[y_{-1}, x_1], \alpha_i(b_i)] + [x_1, \alpha_{i-1}([y_{-1}, b_i])] - [x_1, [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), b_i]]\\
&\quad = \alpha_i([[y_{-1}, x_1], b_i]) + \alpha_i([x_1, [y_{-1}, b_i]]) - [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), [x_1, b_i]]\\
&\quad = \alpha_i([y_{-1}, [x_1, b_i]]) - [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), [x_1, b_i]].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

Thus, if $x_1^1, \ldots, x_1^l \in V_1$ and $b_i^1, \ldots, b_i^l \in V_i$ satisfy $\sum_{s=1}^{l}[x_1^s, b_i^s] = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l}[y_{-1}, [\alpha_1(x_1^s), b_i^s] + [x_1^s, \alpha_i(b_i^s)]] = 0$$

for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$. Therefore, we have $\sum_{s=1}^{l}([\alpha_1(x_1^s), b_i^s]+[x_1^s, \alpha_i(b_i^s)]) = 0$ and the well-definedness of α_{i+1}. Moreover, α_{i+1} satisfies the following equations:

$$\alpha_{i+1}([a_0, b_{i+1}]) = [\alpha_0(a_0), b_{i+1}] + [a_0, \alpha_{i+1}(b_{i+1})], \tag{2.43}$$

$$\alpha_{i+1}([x_1, b_i]) = [\alpha_1(x_1), b_i] + [x_1, \alpha_i(b_i)], \tag{2.44}$$

$$\alpha_i([y_{-1}, b_{i+1}]) = [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), b_{i+1}] + [y_{-1}, \alpha_{i+1}(b_{i+1})] \tag{2.45}$$

for any $a_0 \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $b_i \in V_i$ and $b_{i+1} \in V_{i+1}$. In fact, for any $a_0 \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, and $b_i \in V_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{i+1}([a_0, [x_1, b_i]]) &= \alpha_{i+1}([[a_0, x_1], b_i]) + \alpha_{i+1}([x_1, [a_0, b_i]]) \\
&= [\alpha_1([a_0, x_1]), b_i] + [[a_0, x_1], \alpha_i(b_i)] + [\alpha_1(x_1), [a_0, b_i]] + [x_1, \alpha_i([a_0, b_i])] \\
&= [[\alpha_0(a_0), x_1], b_i] + [[a_0, \alpha_1(x_1)], b_i] + [[a_0, x_1], \alpha_i(b_i)] \\
&\quad + [\alpha_1(x_1), [a_0, b_i]] + [x_1, [\alpha_0(a_0), b_i]] + [x_1, [a_0, \alpha_i(b_i)]] \\
&= [\alpha_0(a_0), [x_1, b_i]] + [a_0, [\alpha_1(x_1), b_i]] + [a_0, [x_1, \alpha_i(b_i)]] \\
&= [\alpha_0(a_0), [x_1, b_i]] + [a_0, \alpha_{i+1}([x_1, b_i])].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

Thus, we can obtain the equation (2.43). The equation (2.44) is clear. The equation (2.45) follows from (2.42). Thus, inductively, we can obtain linear maps α_i for all $i \geq 0$, and, similarly, we can construct linear maps $\alpha_{-i} : V_{-i} \to V_{-i}$ for all $i \geq 0$. Consequently, we have linear maps $\alpha_n : V_n \to V_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ which satisfy

$$\alpha_n([a_0, b_n]) = [\alpha_0(a_0), b_n] + [a_0, \alpha_n(b_n)], \tag{2.47}$$

$$\alpha_{n+1}([x_1, b_n]) = [\alpha_1(x_1), b_n] + [x_1, \alpha_n(b_n)], \tag{2.48}$$

$$\alpha_{n-1}([y_{-1}, b_n]) = [\alpha_{-1}(y_{-1}), b_n] + [y_{-1}, \alpha_n(b_n)] \tag{2.49}$$

for any $a_0 \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $b_n \in V_n$.

We define a linear map $\alpha : L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \to L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ by:

$$\alpha(a_n) := \alpha_n(a_n) \tag{2.50}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_n \in V_n$. Then α is a derivation of Lie algebras. In fact, we can show the following equation

$$\alpha([a_n, b_m]) = [\alpha(a_n), b_m] + [a_n, \alpha(b_m)] \tag{2.51}$$

for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_n \in V_n$ and $b_m \in V_m$ by the equations (2.47), (2.48), (2.49) inductively. ∎

Lemma 2.38. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad and α be a derivation on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. If α satisfies the equation*

$$B_L(\alpha(z), \omega) = -B_L(z, \alpha(\omega)) \tag{2.52}$$

for any $z = z_n \in V_n$ $(n = 0, \pm 1)$ and $\omega \in L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, then we have the same equation for any $z, \omega \in L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$.

Proof. We argue our claim in the cases where $z = z_n \in V_n$ for some n and prove it by induction on n. Suppose that $n \geq 0$. If $n = 0, 1$, then our claim follows from the assumption. Suppose that $n \geq 2$. Then, by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_L(\alpha([x_1, z_{n-1}]), \omega) &= B_L([\alpha(x_1), z_{n-1}], \omega) + B_L([x_1, \alpha(z_{n-1})], \omega) \\
&= -B_L(z_{n-1}, [\alpha(x_1), \omega]) - B_L(\alpha(z_{n-1}), [x_1, \omega]) \\
&= -B_L(z_{n-1}, [\alpha(x_1), \omega]) + B_L(z_{n-1}, \alpha([x_1, \omega])) \\
&= B_L(z_{n-1}, [x_1, \alpha(\omega)]) \\
&= -B_L([x_1, z_{n-1}], \alpha(\omega))
\end{aligned}$$

for any $x_1 \in V_1$, $z_{n-1} \in V_{n-1}$. Since $V_n = [V_1, V_{n-1}]$, we have our claim for n. Thus, by induction, we have our claim for all $n \geq 0$. Similarly, we can show our claim for $n \leq -1$. ∎

3 Graded modules of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$

3.1 A construction of vector spaces $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$

As mentioned in section 1, the purpose of this and the next section is to construct a positively graded module and a negatively graded module of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ from a given $\mathfrak{g}$-module U, which will be denoted by $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$. First, we construct $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$ as vector spaces by induction.

Definition 3.1. Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad and $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n$ be the Lie algebra associated with it. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \otimes U \to U$ be a representation of $\mathfrak{g} = V_0$ on a vector space U over $\mathfrak{k}$. We put $U_0^+ = U_0^- := U$, $\pi_0^+ = \pi_0^- := \pi$ and define linear maps $r_0^+ : V_1 \otimes U_0^+ \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, U_0^+)$ and $r_0^- : V_{-1} \otimes U_0^- \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, U_0^-)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned}
r_0^+ &: V_1 \otimes U_0^+ \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, U_0^+) \\
&\quad x_1 \otimes u_0 \mapsto (\eta_{-1} \mapsto \pi_0^+([\eta_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u_0)), \qquad (3.1) \\
r_0^- &: V_{-1} \otimes U_0^- \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, U_0^-) \\
&\quad y_{-1} \otimes u_0 \mapsto (\xi_1 \mapsto \pi_0^-([\xi_1, y_{-1}] \otimes u_0)). \qquad (3.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2. *The maps r_0^+ and r_0^- are homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules.*

Proof. We prove for r_0^+. For any elements $a \in \mathfrak{g}$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $\eta_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $u_0 \in U_0^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&r_0^+([a,x_1]\otimes u_0 + x_1 \otimes \pi_0^+(a\otimes u_0))(\eta_{-1}) = \pi_0^+([\eta_{-1},[a,x_1]]\otimes u_0) + \pi_0^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \pi_0^+(a\otimes u_0))\\
&\quad = \pi_0^+([a,[\eta_{-1},x_1]]\otimes u_0) - \pi_0^+([[a,\eta_{-1}],x_1]]\otimes u_0) + \pi_0^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \pi_0^+(a\otimes u_0))\\
&\quad = \pi_0^+(a\otimes \pi_0^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes u_0)) - \pi_0^+([[a,\eta_{-1}],x_1]]\otimes u_0)\\
&\quad = \pi_0^+(a\otimes (r_0^+(x_1\otimes u_0)(\eta_{-1}))) - r_0^+(x_1\otimes u_0)([a,\eta_{-1}]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus r_0^+ is a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Similarly, we can prove that r_0^- is a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. ∎

It follows from Proposition 3.2 that the linear spaces $U_1^+ := \mathrm{Im}\ r_0^+$ and $U_{-1}^- := \mathrm{Im}\ r_0^-$ have the canonical $\mathfrak{g}$-module structures. We denote these canonical representations by π_1^+ and π_{-1}^- respectively. Moreover, we inductively construct $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $U_2^+, U_3^+, \dots$ by using the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that there exist $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (ϖ^+, W^+), (ϖ^-, W^-) and $\mathfrak{g}$-module homomorphisms $\lambda^+ : V_1 \otimes W^+ \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, W^+)$ and $\lambda^- : V_{-1}\otimes W^- \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, W^-)$. We put $\hat{W}^+ := \mathrm{Im}\ \lambda^+$, $\hat{W}^+ := \mathrm{Im}\ \lambda^-$ and denote the canonical representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on them by $\hat{\varpi}^+$ and $\hat{\varpi}^-$ respectively. Then the following linear maps are $\mathfrak{g}$-module homomorphisms:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\lambda}^+ :& V_1 \otimes \hat{W}^+ \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, \hat{W}^+)\\
&x_1 \otimes \hat{w}^+ \mapsto (\eta_{-1} \mapsto \hat{\varpi}^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+) + \lambda^+(x_1 \otimes \hat{w}^+(\eta_{-1}))), \qquad (3.3)\\
\hat{\lambda}^- :& V_{-1} \otimes \hat{W}^- \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, \hat{W}^-)\\
&y_{-1} \otimes \hat{w}^- \mapsto (\xi_1 \mapsto \hat{\varpi}^-([\xi_1,y_{-1}]\otimes \hat{w}^-) + \lambda^-(y_{-1} \otimes \hat{w}^-(\xi_1))). \qquad (3.4)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We can prove it by a similar argument to the argument of [9, Proposition 1.10]. Take any elements $a \in \mathfrak{g}$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $\eta_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $\hat{w}^+ \in \hat{W}^+$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\hat{\lambda}^+([a,x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+) + \hat{\lambda}^+(x_1 \otimes \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{w}^+)))(\eta_{-1})\\
&\quad = \hat{\varpi}^+([\eta_{-1},[a,x_1]]\otimes \hat{w}^+) + \lambda^+([a,x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+(\eta_{-1}))\\
&\qquad + \hat{\varpi}^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{w}^+)) + \lambda^+(x_1 \otimes (\hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{w}^+)(\eta_{-1})))\\
&\quad = \hat{\varpi}^+([a,[\eta_{-1},x_1]]\otimes \hat{w}^+) + \hat{\varpi}^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{w}^+)) + \lambda^+([a,x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+(\eta_{-1}))\\
&\qquad + \lambda^+(x_1 \otimes \varpi^+(a\otimes \hat{w}^+(\eta_{-1}))) - \hat{\varpi}^+([[a,\eta_{-1}],x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+) - \lambda^+(x_1\otimes \hat{w}^+([a,\eta_{-1}]))\\
&\quad = \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{\varpi}^+([\eta_{-1},x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+)) + \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \lambda^+(x_1\otimes \hat{w}^+(\eta_{-1})))\\
&\qquad - \hat{\varpi}^+([[a,\eta_{-1}],x_1]\otimes \hat{w}^+) - \lambda^+(x_1\otimes \hat{w}^+([a,\eta_{-1}]))\\
&\quad = \hat{\varpi}^+(a\otimes \hat{\lambda}^+(x_1\otimes \hat{w}^+)(\eta_{-1})) - \hat{\lambda}^+(x_1\otimes \hat{w}^+)([a,\eta_{-1}]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\hat{\lambda}^+$ is a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. By the same way, we can prove that $\hat{\lambda}^-$ is also a $\mathfrak{g}$-module homomorphism. ∎

Definition 3.4. Suppose that $j \geq 1$ and there exist $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (π^+_{j-1}, U^+_{j-1}), $(\pi^-_{-j+1}, U^-_{-j+1})$ and homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $r^+_{j-1} : V_1 \otimes U^+_{j-1} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, U^+_{j-1})$ and $r^-_{-j+1} : V_{-1} \otimes U^-_{-j+1} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, U^-_{-j+1})$. Put $U^+_j := \mathrm{Im}\ r^+_{j-1}$ and $U^-_{-j} := \mathrm{Im}\ r^-_{-j+1}$. Then we define linear maps r^+_j and r^-_{-j} by:

$$\begin{aligned} r^+_j &: V_1 \otimes U^+_j \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, U^+_j) \\ &\quad x_1 \otimes u^+_j \mapsto (\eta_1 \mapsto \pi^+_j([\eta_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u^+_j) + r^+_{j-1}(x_1 \otimes u^+_j(\eta_{-1}))), \qquad (3.5) \\ r^-_{-j} &: V_{-1} \otimes U^-_{-j} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_1, U^-_{-j}) \\ &\quad y_{-1} \otimes u^-_{-j} \mapsto (\xi_1 \mapsto \pi^-_{-j}([\xi_1, y_{-1}] \otimes u^-_{-j}) + r^-_{-j+1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^-_{-j}(\xi_1))). \qquad (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Proposition 3.3, r^+_j and r^-_{-j} are homomorphisms of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. We denote by U^+_{j+1} and U^-_{-j-1} the images of r^+_j and r^-_{-j} and the canonical representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on U^+_{j+1} and U^-_{-j-1} by π^+_{j+1} and π^-_{-j-1} respectively. Moreover, we put

$$U^+_{-j} := \{0\}, \quad U^-_j := \{0\}$$

for $j \geq 1$. We denote the zero representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ on U^+_{-j} and U^-_j by π^+_{-j} and π^-_j for all $j \geq 1$. Thus, inductively, we obtain $\mathfrak{g}$-modules (π^+_m, U^+_m), (π^-_m, U^-_m) for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Under these notation, we define linear spaces $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$ by:

$$\tilde{U}^+ := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} U^+_n, \quad \tilde{U}^- := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} U^-_n. \qquad (3.7)$$

Throughout this paper, we use these notation.

3.2 A construction of representations of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ on $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$

In this section, we define $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module structures on vector spaces $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$ constructed in (3.7). For this, we start with the following definition.

Definition 3.5. We define the following linear maps:

$$\pi^+_{0,m} : V_0 \otimes U^+_m \to U^+_m, \quad \pi^+_{1,m} : V_1 \otimes U^+_m \to U^+_{m+1}, \quad \pi^+_{-1,m} : V_{-1} \otimes U^+_m \to U^+_{m-1}$$

by:

$$\pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m) := \pi^+_m(a \otimes u^+_m) \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}), \qquad (3.8)$$

$$\pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m) := \begin{cases} r^+_m(x_1 \otimes u^+_m) & (m \geq 0) \\ 0 & (m \leq -1) \end{cases}, \qquad (3.9)$$

$$\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_m) := \begin{cases} u^+_m(y_{-1}) & (m \geq 1) \\ 0 & (m \leq 0) \end{cases} \qquad (3.10)$$

where $a \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $u^+_m \in U^+_m$.

By the above definition, we can obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Under the above notation, we have the following equations:*

$$\pi^+_{1,m}([x_1,a]\otimes u^+_m)=\pi^+_{1,m}(x_1\otimes\pi^+_{0,m}(a\otimes u^+_m))-\pi^+_{0,m+1}(a\otimes\pi^+_{1,m}(x_1\otimes u^+_m)), \tag{3.11}$$

$$\pi^+_{-1,m}([y_{-1},a]\otimes u^+_m)=\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}\otimes\pi^+_{0,m}(a\otimes u^+_m))-\pi^+_{0,m-1}(a\otimes\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}\otimes u^+_m)), \tag{3.12}$$

$$\pi^+_{1,m-1}(x_1\otimes\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}\otimes u^+_m))=\pi^+_{0,m}([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes u_m)+\pi^+_{-1,m+1}(y_{-1}\otimes\pi^+_{1,m}(x_1\otimes u_m)). \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Let us show (3.13). The equations (3.11) and (3.12) can be shown similarly. If $m\leq -1$, then (3.13) is clear. If $m=0$, then the left hand side equals to 0. For the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\pi^+_{0,0}([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes u_0)+\pi^+_{-1,1}(y_{-1}\otimes\pi^+_{1,0}(x_1\otimes u_0))\\&\quad=\pi^+_0([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes u^+_0)+r^+_0(x_1\otimes u^+_0)(y_{-1})=\pi^+_0([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes u^+_0)+\pi^+_0([y_{-1},x_1]\otimes u^+_0)=0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have (3.13) when $m=0$. For $m\geq 1$, the equation (3.13) follows from definition. ∎

Definition 3.7. We define the following linear maps for $i\geq 1$ inductively:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^+_{i+1,m}\ &:V_{i+1}\otimes U^+_m\to U^+_{i+m+1}\\&\quad p_i(x_1\otimes z_i)\otimes u^+_m\mapsto\pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1\otimes\pi^+_{i,m}(z_i\otimes u^+_m))-\pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i\otimes\pi^+_{1,m}(x_1\otimes u^+_m)),\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^+_{-i-1,m}\ &:V_{-i-1}\otimes U^+_m\to U^+_{-i+m-1}\\&\quad q_{-i}(y_{-1}\otimes\omega_{-i})\otimes u^+_m\mapsto\pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1}\otimes\pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i}\otimes u^+_m))\\&\qquad\qquad-\pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i}\otimes\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}\otimes u^+_m)).\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Note that the linear maps $\pi^+_{0,m}$, $\pi^+_{\pm1,m}$ defined in Definition 3.5 satisfy the same equations as (3.14) and (3.15) in the cases where $i=0$ by Proposition 3.6. For $i\geq 1$, we must show the well-definedness of Definition 3.7. To prove it, let us show the following two propositions.

Proposition 3.8. *(The well-definedness of $\pi^+_{i+1,m}$ given in (3.14)) Suppose that $i\geq 0$. Suppose that the linear map $\pi^+_{i,m}$ defined in (3.14) is well-defined for any $m\in\mathbb{Z}$ and satisfies the following equations:*

$$\pi^+_{0,i+m}(a\otimes\pi^+_{i,m}(z_i\otimes u^+_m))=\pi^+_{i,m}([a,z_i]\otimes u^+_m)+\pi^+_{i,m}(z_i\otimes\pi^+_{0,m}(a\otimes u^+_m)), \tag{3.16}$$

$$\pi^+_{i,m-1}(z_i\otimes\pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}\otimes u^+_m))=\pi^+_{i-1,m}([z_i,y_{-1}]\otimes u^+_m)+\pi^+_{-1,i+m}(y_{-1}\otimes\pi^+_{i,m}(z_i\otimes u^+_m)). \tag{3.17}$$

If $x^1_1,\dots,x^l_1\in V_1$ and $z^1_i,\dots,z^l_i\in V_i$ satisfy $\sum_{s=1}^l p_i(x^s_1\otimes z^s_i)=0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l}(\pi^+_{1,i+m}(x^s_1\otimes\pi^+_{i,m}(z^s_i\otimes u^+_m))-\pi^+_{i,m+1}(z^s_i\otimes\pi^+_{1,m}(x^s_1\otimes u^+_m)))=0 \tag{3.18}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u_m^+ \in U_m^+$. In particular, we can obtain the well-definedness of the linear map $\pi_{i+1,m}^+$ defined in (3.14) for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the linear maps $\pi_{i+1,m}^+$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}$) satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_{0,i+m+1}^+(a \otimes \pi_{i+1,m}^+(z_{i+1} \otimes u_m^+)) \\
&\quad = \pi_{i+1,m}^+([a, z_{i+1}] \otimes u_m^+) + \pi_{i+1,m}^+(z_{i+1} \otimes \pi_{0,m}^+(a \otimes u_m^+)), \qquad (3.19)\\
&\pi_{i+1,m-1}^+(z_{i+1} \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+)) \\
&\quad = \pi_{i,m}^+([z_{i+1}, y_{-1}] \otimes u_m^+) + \pi_{-1,i+m+1}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \pi_{i+1,m}^+(z_{i+1} \otimes u_m^+)). \qquad (3.20)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We argue by induction on i. For $i = 0$, our claim follows from Proposition 3.6. Suppose that $i \geq 1$. We fix i and argue (3.18) by induction on m. First, if $m \leq -1$, then the equation (3.18) is clear. If $m \geq 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_{-1,i+m+1}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \pi_{1,i+m}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes u_m^+)) - \pi_{i,m+1}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{1,m}^+(x_1 \otimes u_m^+))) \\
&\quad = \pi_{0,i+m}^+([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes u_m^+)) + \pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{-1,i+m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes u_m^+))) \\
&\qquad - \pi_{i-1,m+1}^+([y_{-1}, z_i] \otimes \pi_{1,m}^+(x_1 \otimes u_m^+)) - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{-1,m+1}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \pi_{1,m}^+(x_1 \otimes u_m^+))) \\
&\quad = \pi_{0,i+m}^+([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes u_m^+)) + \pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{i-1,m}^+([y_{-1}, z_i] \otimes u_m^+)) \\
&\qquad + \pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{i,m-1}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) - \pi_{i-1,m+1}^+([y_{-1}, z_i] \otimes \pi_{1,m}^+(x_1 \otimes u_m^+)) \\
&\qquad - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{0,m}^+([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u_m^+)) - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{1,m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) \\
&\quad = \pi_{i,m}^+([[y_{-1}, x_1], z_i] \otimes u_m^+) + \pi_{i,m}^+([x_1, [y_{-1}, z_i]] \otimes u_m^+) \\
&\qquad + \pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{i,m-1}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{1,m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) \\
&\quad = \pi_{i,m}^+([y_{-1}, [x_1, z_i]] \otimes u_m^+) \\
&\qquad + \pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{i,m-1}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i \otimes \pi_{1,m-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) \qquad (3.21)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $x_1 \in V_1$, $z_i \in V_i$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $u_m^+ \in U_m^+$. By the induction hypotheses on i and m, if we take elements $x_1^1, \ldots, x_1^l \in V_1$ and $z_i^1, \ldots, z_i^l \in V_i$ satisfying $\sum_{s=1}^l p_i(x_1^s \otimes z_i^s) = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} \pi_{i,m}^+([[x_1^s, z_i^s], y_{-1}] \otimes u_m^+) = 0 \quad \text{(by the induction hypothesis on } i\text{)}, \qquad (3.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{s=1}^{l} (\pi_{1,i+m-1}^+(x_1^s \otimes \pi_{i,m-1}^+(z_i^s \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+))) - \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i^s \otimes \pi_{1,m-1}^+(x_1^s \otimes \pi_{-1,m}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_m^+)))) \\
&\quad = 0 \quad \text{(by the induction hypothesis on } m\text{)}. \qquad (3.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} \pi_{-1,i+m+1}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \pi_{1,i+m}^+(x_1^s \otimes \pi_{i,m}^+(z_i^s \otimes u_m^+)) - \pi_{i,m+1}^+(z_i^s \otimes \pi_{1,m}^+(x_1^s \otimes u_m^+))) = 0 \qquad (3.24)$$

from (3.21). Since $i+m+1 \geq 1$, we can obtain that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l}(\pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1^s \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i^s \otimes r_{m+1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m+1}))) - \pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i^s \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes r_{m+1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m+1}))))$$
$$= 0 \in U^+_{i+m+1} \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, U^+_{i+m}). \tag{3.25}$$

Therefore we can obtain the well-definedness of the linear map $\pi_m^{i+1} : V_{i+1} \otimes U_m^+ \to U^+_{i+m+1}$ given in (3.14) for any m.

In order to complete the proof, we must show the equations (3.19) and (3.20). Let us show (3.19). Under the above notation, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi^+_{0,i+m+1}(a \otimes \pi^+_{i+1,m}(p_i(x_1 \otimes z_i) \otimes u^+_m))\\
&\quad = \pi^+_{0,i+m+1}(a \otimes \pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i \otimes u^+_m))) - \pi^+_{0,i+m+1}(a \otimes \pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)))\\
&\quad = \pi^+_{1,i+m}([a,x_1] \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i \otimes u^+_m)) + \pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{0,i+m}(a \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i \otimes u^+_m)))\\
&\qquad - \pi^+_{i,m+1}([a,z_i] \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)) - \pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i \otimes \pi^+_{0,m+1}(a \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)))\\
&\quad = \pi^+_{1,i+m}([a,x_1] \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i \otimes u^+_m)) + \pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}([a,z_i] \otimes u^+_m))\\
&\qquad + \pi^+_{1,i+m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{i,m}(z_i \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m))) - \pi^+_{i,m+1}([a,z_i] \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m))\\
&\qquad - \pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}([a,x_1] \otimes u^+_m)) - \pi^+_{i,m+1}(z_i \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m)))\\
&\quad = \pi^+_{i+1,m}([[a,x_1],z_i] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{i+1,m}([x_1,[a,z_i]] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{i+1,m}([x_1,z_i] \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m))\\
&\quad = \pi^+_{i+1,m}([a,p_i(x_1 \otimes z_i)] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{i+1,m}(p_i(x_1 \otimes z_i) \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have (3.19). The equation (3.20) follows from (3.21). This completes the proof. ∎

Proposition 3.9. *(The well-definedness of $\pi^+_{-i-1,m}$ given in (3.15)) Suppose that $i \geq 0$. Suppose that the linear map $\pi^+_{-i,m}$ defined in (3.15) is well-defined for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and satisfies the following equations:*

$$\pi^+_{0,-i+m}(a \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_m)) = \pi^+_{-i,m}([a,\omega_{-i}] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m)), \tag{3.26}$$
$$\pi^+_{-i,m+1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)) = \pi^+_{-i+1,m}([\omega_{-i},x_1] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{1,-i+m}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_m)). \tag{3.27}$$

If $y^1_{-1}, \dots, y^l_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $\omega^1_{-i}, \dots, \omega^l_{-i} \in V_{-i}$ satisfy $\sum_{s=1}^l q_{-i}(y^s_{-1} \otimes \omega^s_{-i}) = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l}(\pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y^s_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega^s_{-i} \otimes u^+_m)) - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega^s_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m}(y^s_{-1} \otimes u^+_m))) = 0 \tag{3.28}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u^+_m \in U^+_m$. In particular, we can obtain the well-definedness of the linear map $\pi^+_{-i-1,m}$ defined in (3.15) for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the maps $\pi^+_{-i-1,m}$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}$) satisfy the

following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi^+_{0,-i+m-1}(a \otimes \pi^+_{-i-1,m}(\omega_{-i-1} \otimes u^+_m)) \\
&\qquad = \pi^+_{-i-1,m}([a, \omega_{-i-1}] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{-i-1,m}(\omega_{-i-1} \otimes \pi^+_{0,m}(a \otimes u^+_m)), \qquad (3.29)\\
&\pi^+_{-i-1,m+1}(\omega_{-i-1} \otimes \pi^+_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)) \\
&\qquad = \pi^+_{-i,m}([\omega_{-i-1}, x_1] \otimes u^+_m) + \pi^+_{1,-i+m-1}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i-1,m}(\omega_{-i-1} \otimes u^+_m)). \qquad (3.30)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $i = 0$, then our claim immediately follows from the definition. Suppose that $i \geq 1$. We fix i and discuss by induction on m. If $m \leq 0$, the equation (3.28) is clear. Suppose that $m \geq 1$. Then, for any $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $\omega_{-i} \in V_{-i}$ and $u^+_{m-1} \in U^+_{m-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{1,m-1}(x_1 \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{1,m-1}(x_1 \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&= \pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i+1,m-1}([\omega_{-i}, x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1})) \\
&\quad + \pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{1,-i+m-1}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{0,m-1}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1})) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{1,m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&= \pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i+1,m-1}([\omega_{-i}, x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1})) - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{0,m-1}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1})) \\
&\quad + \pi^+_{0,-i+m-1}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1})) \\
&\quad + \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-1,-i+m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{-i+1,m-2}([\omega_{-i}, x_1] \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1})) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-2}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&= -\pi^+_{-i,m-1}([[\omega_{-i}, x_1], y_{-1}] \otimes u^+_{m-1}) + \pi^+_{-i,m-1}([[y_{-1}, x_1], \omega_{-i}] \otimes u^+_{m-1}) \\
&\quad + \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-1,-i+m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-2}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&= \pi^+_{-i,m-1}([[y_{-1}, \omega_{-i}], x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1}) \\
&\quad + \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-1,-i+m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) \\
&\quad - \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-2}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))). \qquad (3.31)
\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypotheses on i and m, if we take elements $y^1_{-1}, \ldots, y^l_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $\omega^1_{-i}, \ldots, \omega^l_{-i} \in$

V_{-i} satisfying $\sum_{s=1}^{l} q_{-i}(y_{-1}^s \otimes \omega_{-i}^s) = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} \pi^+_{-i,m-1}([[y_{-1}^s, \omega_{-i}^s], x_1] \otimes u^+_{m-1}) = 0 \quad \text{(by the induction hypothesis on } i\text{)}, \tag{3.32}$$

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} (\pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-1,-i+m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i} \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) - \pi^+_{1,-i+m-2}(x_1 \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m-2}(\omega_{-i} \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m-1}(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_{m-1})))) = 0$$
$$\text{(by the induction hypothesis on } m\text{)}. \tag{3.33}$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} (\pi^+_{-1,-i+m}(y_{-1}^s \otimes \pi^+_{-i,m}(\omega_{-i}^s \otimes \pi^+_{1,m-1}(x_1 \otimes u^+_{m-1}))) - \pi^+_{-i,m-1}(\omega_{-i}^s \otimes \pi^+_{-1,m}(y_{-1}^s \otimes \pi^+_{1,m-1}(x_1 \otimes u^+_{m-1})))) = 0 \tag{3.34}$$

from (3.31). Since $\pi^+_{1,m-1} : V_1 \otimes U^+_{m-1} \to U^+_m$ is surjective, we can obtain the equation (3.28). Therefore we can obtain the well-definedness of the linear map $\pi^+_{-i-1,m} : V_{-i-1} \otimes U^+_m \to U^+_{-i+m-1}$ given in (3.15) for any m.

The equation (3.29) can be shown by a similar way to the proof of Proposition 3.8. Moreover, the equation (3.30) follows from (3.31). ∎

Definition 3.10. By the above propositions, Propositions 3.8 and 3.9, we define a linear map $\tilde{\pi}^+ : L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) \otimes \tilde{U}^+ \to \tilde{U}^+$ by:

$$\tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes u^+_m) := \pi^+_{n,m}(z_n \otimes u^+_m)$$

where $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $z_n \in V_n$ and $u^+_m \in U^+_m$.

This linear map $\tilde{\pi}^+$ satisfies the following equations:

$$\tilde{\pi}^+([a, z_n] \otimes u^+_m) = \tilde{\pi}^+(a \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes u^+_m)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(a \otimes u^+_m)),$$
$$\tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, z_n] \otimes u^+_m) = \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes u^+_m)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+_m)),$$
$$\tilde{\pi}^+([y_{-1}, z_n] \otimes u^+_m) = \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes u^+_m)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_n \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_m))$$

for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $z_n \in V_n$ and $u^+_m \in U^+_m$. Moreover, we have the following proposition on $\tilde{\pi}^+$.

Proposition 3.11. *The map $\tilde{\pi}^+$ satisfies the following equation:*

$$\tilde{\pi}^+([x, y] \otimes u) = \tilde{\pi}^+(x \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x \otimes u)) \tag{3.35}$$

for any $x, y \in L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $u^+ \in \tilde{U}^+$.

Proof. To prove our claim, it is sufficient to show the case where $x = z_n \in V_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We argue by induction on n.

Assume that $n \geq 0$. For $n = 0, 1$, our result has been shown. For $n \geq 2$. We can assume that $z_n = p_{n-1}(x_1 \otimes z_{n-1})$ for some $x_1 \in V_1$ and $z_{n-1} \in V_{n-1}$ without loss of generality. Then, by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\pi}^+([p_{n-1}(x_1 \otimes z_{n-1}), y] \otimes u^+) = \tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, [z_{n-1}, y]] \otimes u^+) - \tilde{\pi}^+([z_{n-1}, [x_1, y]] \otimes u^+) \\
&\quad = \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+([z_{n-1}, y] \otimes u^+)) - \tilde{\pi}^+([z_{n-1}, y] \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+)) \\
&\qquad - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, y] \otimes u^+)) + \tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, y] \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes u^+)) \\
&\quad = \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+))) - \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes u^+))) \\
&\qquad - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+))) + \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+))) \\
&\qquad - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+))) + \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+))) \\
&\qquad + \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes u^+))) - \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes u^+))) \\
&\quad = \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+))) - \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+))) \\
&\qquad - \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes u^+))) + \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(z_{n-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u^+))) \\
&\quad = \tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, z_{n-1}] \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+([x_1, z_{n-1}] \otimes u^+)) \\
&\quad = \tilde{\pi}^+(p_{n-1}(x_1 \otimes z_{n-1}) \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes u^+)) - \tilde{\pi}^+(y \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(p_{n-1}(x_1 \otimes z_{n-1}) \otimes u^+)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have our result for any $n \geq 0$.

Similarly, we can obtain our result for any $n \leq -1$. This completes the proof. ∎

From Proposition 3.11, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.12. *The vector space $\tilde{U}^+ = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} U^+_m = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} U^+_m$ has a structure of a positively graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module whose representation is $\tilde{\pi}^+$. We call the module $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$* the positive extension of U with respect to a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. *(This is a special case of [2, Theorem 1.2].)*

By the same argument, we can obtain a negatively graded Lie module of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$.

Definition 3.13. We define the following linear maps:

$$\pi^-_{0,m} : V_0 \otimes U^-_m \to U^-_m, \quad \pi^-_{1,m} : V_1 \otimes U^-_m \to U^-_{m+1}, \quad \pi^-_{-1,m} : V_{-1} \otimes U^-_m \to U^-_{m-1}$$

by:

$$\pi^-_{0,m}(a \otimes u^-_m) := \pi^-_m(a \otimes u^-_m), \tag{3.36}$$

$$\pi^-_{1,m}(x_1 \otimes u^-_m) := \begin{cases} 0 & (m \geq 0) \\ u^-_m(x_1) & (m \leq -1) \end{cases}, \tag{3.37}$$

$$\pi^-_{-1,m}(y_{-1} \otimes u^-_m) := \begin{cases} 0 & (m \geq 1) \\ r^-_m(y_{-1} \otimes u^-_m) & (m \leq 0) \end{cases} \tag{3.38}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \in V_0$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $u^-_m \in U^-_m$.

Theorem 3.14. *The vector space $\tilde{U}^- = \bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} U^-_m = \bigoplus_{m\leq 0} U^-_m$ has a structure of a negatively graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module whose representation is $\tilde{\pi}^-$. We call the module $(\tilde{\pi}^-, \tilde{U}^-)$* the negative extension of U with respect to a standard pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. *(This is a special case of [2, Theorem 1.2].)*

Note that an arbitrary module of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is not necessary written in the form of $\tilde{U}^+$ or $\tilde{U}^-$. For example, the adjoint representation of a loop algebra $L(\mathfrak{sl}_2, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{sl}_2, \mathfrak{sl}_2, K_{\mathfrak{sl}_2}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})) = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}] \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}t^n \otimes \mathfrak{sl}_2$, where $K_{\mathfrak{sl}_2}$ is the Killing form of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$, cannot be written in the form of positively or negatively graded module. Indeed, $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ does not have a non-zero element which commutes with any element of the form $t \otimes X$ or $t^{-1} \otimes X$ $(X \in \mathfrak{sl}_2)$.

Proposition 3.15. *Under the notation of Theorems 3.12 and 3.14, $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{U}^-$ have the following properties:*

$$\tilde{U}^+ \text{ and } \tilde{U}^- \text{ are transitive,} \tag{3.39}$$

$$\tilde{U}^+ \text{ and } \tilde{U}^- \text{ are } L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)\text{-irreducible if and only if } U = U^+_0 = U^-_0 \text{ is } \mathfrak{g}\text{-irreducible.} \tag{3.40}$$

(This is a special case of [2, Theorem 1.1].)

Proof. By the definition, we can show (3.39) immediately.

Let us show (3.40). Assume that U is an irreducible $\mathfrak{g}$-module. Let $\underline{W}$ be an arbitrary non-zero $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-submodule of $\tilde{U}^+$. Then we have that $\underline{W} \cap U^+_0 \neq \{0\}$ (cf. [2, Corollary 1.2]). In fact, take a non-zero element $\underline{w} \in \underline{W}$. Then there exist integers $0 \leq m_1 < \cdots < m_k$ and $\underline{w}_{m_1} \in \underline{W} \cap U^+_{m_1}, \ldots, \underline{w}_{m_k} \in \underline{W} \cap U^+_{m_k}$ such that $\underline{w} = \underline{w}_{m_1} + \cdots + \underline{w}_{m_k}$. Since $\tilde{U}^+$ is transitive, we can take $y^1_{-1}, \ldots, y^{m_k}_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ such that $0 \neq \tilde{\pi}^+(y^1_{-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y^{m_k}_{-1} \otimes w)\cdots) \in \underline{W} \cap U^+_0$. By the assumption that U is irreducible, we have $\underline{W} \cap U^+_0 = U$. Since $\tilde{U}^+$ is generated by $U = U^+_0$ and V_0, V_1, we have that $\underline{W}$ coincides with $\tilde{U}^+$.

Conversely, assume that $\tilde{U}^+$ is an irreducible $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module. Take a non-zero $\mathfrak{g}$-submodule W of U. Then a submodule $\underline{W}$ of $\tilde{U}^+$ which is generated by V_0, V_1, W is a non-zero $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-submodule of $\tilde{U}^+$. Thus, $\underline{W} = \tilde{U}^+$, and, in particular, $W = \underline{W} \cap U^+_0 = U$. Similarly, we can show (3.40) for the negative extension $\tilde{U}^-$. ∎

Example 3.16. We retain to use the notation of Example 2.35. Put $U := \mathbb{C}$ and define a representation $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \otimes U \to U$ by:

$$\pi((a, b, A) \otimes u) := au$$

for any $u \in U$. Then, the positive extension $\tilde{U}^+$ of U with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is 3-dimensional irreducible representation of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = V_{-1} \oplus V_0 \oplus V_1 \simeq \mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_3$. In fact, for any $v \in V_1 = V$, $\phi \in V_{-1} = \mathcal{V}$ and $u \in U$, we have

$$\tilde{\pi}^+(\phi \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes u)) = -\tilde{\pi}^+(\Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi) \otimes u) = -\pi((-{}^t v\phi, \frac{3}{2}{}^t v\phi, v^t\phi - \frac{1}{2}{}^t v\phi I_2) \otimes u) = {}^t v\phi u.$$

Thus, the element $\tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes u)$ can be identified with $uv \in V_1 = V$ via $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V$, in particular, U_1^+ is 2-dimensional. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\pi}^+(\phi \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v' \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes u))) \\
&\quad = -\tilde{\pi}^+((-{}^t v'\phi, \frac{3}{2}{}^t v'\phi, v'^t\phi - \frac{1}{2}{}^t v'\phi I_2) \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes u)) + \tilde{\pi}^+(v' \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(\phi \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes u))) \\
&\quad = -\tilde{\pi}^+({}^t v'\phi \cdot v \otimes u) - \tilde{\pi}^+({}^t v\phi \cdot v' \otimes u) + \tilde{\pi}^+(v \otimes {}^t v'\phi u) + \tilde{\pi}^+(v' \otimes {}^t v\phi u) \\
&\quad = 0
\end{aligned}$$

for any $v, v' \in V_1$, $\phi \in V_{-1}$ and $u \in U$. Therefore, the positive extension $\tilde{U}^+ = U_0^+ \oplus U_1^+$ is a 3-dimensional irreducible representation (see Proposition 3.15).

The positive and negative extensions of U are characterized by the transitivity.

Theorem 3.17. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad. Let $(\underline{\pi}, \underline{U}) = (\underline{\pi}, \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \underline{U}_m)$ (respectively $(\underline{\varpi}, \underline{\mathcal{U}}) = (\underline{\varpi}, \bigoplus_{m \leq 0} \underline{\mathcal{U}}_m)$) be a positively graded Lie module (respectively a negatively graded Lie module) of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$. If the $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-module $(\underline{\pi}, \underline{U})$ (respectively $(\underline{\varpi}, \underline{\mathcal{U}})$) is transitive and generated by V_0, V_1 and $\underline{U}_0$ (respectively generated by V_0, V_{-1} and $\underline{\mathcal{U}}_0$), then $\underline{U}$ is isomorphic to the positive extension of $\underline{U}_0$ with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ (respectively $\underline{\mathcal{U}}$ is isomorphic to the negative extension of $\underline{\mathcal{U}}_0$ with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$). (This is a special case of [2, Theorem 1.2].)*

Proof. We denote the positive extension of $\underline{U}_0$ with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ by

$$\widetilde{\underline{U}_0}^+ = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\underline{U})_m^+$$

and the canonical representation of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ on $\widetilde{\underline{U}_0}^+$ by $\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+$. Note that $(\underline{U})_0^+ = \underline{U}_0$. We let $\tau_0 : (\underline{U})_0^+ \to \underline{U}_0$ be the identity map on $(\underline{U})_0^+ = \underline{U}_0$ and define linear maps $\tau_i : (\underline{U})_i^+ \to \underline{U}_i$ by

$$\tau_i(r_{i-1}^+(x_1 \otimes \underline{u}_{i-1}^+)) := \underline{\pi}(x_1 \otimes \tau_{i-1}(\underline{u}_{i-1}^+))$$

for $i \geq 1$ and any $x_1 \in V_1$ and $\underline{u}^+_{i-1} \in (\underline{U})^+_{i-1}$ inductively. These τ_i's are well-defined and satisfy the following equation:

$$\tau_{i+j}(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(a_j \otimes \underline{u}^+_i)) = \underline{\pi}(a_j \otimes \tau_i(\underline{u}^+_i)) \tag{3.41}$$

for $j = 0, \pm 1$ and any $a_j \in V_j$, $\underline{u}^+_i \in (\underline{U})^+_i$. Let us show it by induction on i. It is clear that the equation (3.41) holds when $i = 0$ and $j = 0, -1$. In order to show the equation (3.41) for $i = 0$ and $j = 1$, let us show that τ_1 is well-defined. Take an arbitrary element $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\pi}(y_{-1} \otimes \underline{\pi}(x_1 \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^+_0))) &= \underline{\pi}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^+_0)) + \underline{\pi}(x_1 \otimes \underline{\pi}(y_{-1} \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^+_0))) \\ &= \underline{\pi}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^+_0)) = \tau_0(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \underline{u}^+_0)) = \tau_0(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(y_{-1} \otimes r^+_0(x_1 \otimes \underline{u}^+_0))).\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Thus, if $x^1_1, \ldots, x^l_1 \in V_1$ and $\underline{u}^{+1}_0, \ldots, \underline{u}^{+l}_0 \in (\underline{U})^+_0$ satisfy $\sum_{s=1}^l r^+_0(x^s_1 \otimes \underline{u}^{+s}_0) = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} \underline{\pi}(y_{-1} \otimes \underline{\pi}(x^s_1 \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^{+s}_0))) = 0$$

for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$. Since $(\underline{\pi}, \underline{U})$ is transitive, it follows that $\sum_{s=1}^l \underline{\pi}(x^s_1 \otimes \tau_0(\underline{u}^{+s}_0)) = 0$, and, thus, we have the well-definedness of τ_1. By the equation (3.42), we can obtain the equation (3.41) where $i = 0$ and $j = 1$.

Let $i \geq 1$ and assume that $\tau_0, \ldots, \tau_i$ are well-defined and that τ_i satisfies the equation (3.41) for $j = 0, -1$. Then for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\pi}(y_{-1} \otimes \underline{\pi}(x_1 \otimes \tau_i(\underline{u}^+_i))) &= \underline{\pi}([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \tau_i(\underline{u}^+_i)) + \underline{\pi}(x_1 \otimes \underline{\pi}(y_{-1} \otimes \tau_i(\underline{u}^+_i))) \\ &= \tau_i(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+([y_{-1}, x_1] \otimes \underline{u}^+_i)) + \tau_i(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(x_1 \otimes \widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \underline{u}^+_i))) \\ &= \tau_i(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(x_1 \otimes \underline{u}^+_i))) = \tau_i(\widetilde{\underline{\pi}}^+(y_{-1} \otimes r^+_0(x_1 \otimes \underline{u}^+_i))).\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

Thus, by the same argument to the argument of the case where $i = 0$ and $j = 1$, we have the well-definedness of τ_{i+1}, i.e. τ_i satisfies satisfies the equation (3.41) for $j = 1$, and that τ_{i+1} satisfies the equation (3.41) for $j = -1$. Moreover, by a similar argument to the argument of (3.43), we have that τ_{i+1} satisfies the equation (3.41) for $j = 0$. Therefore, by induction on i, we can obtain the well-definedness of τ_i and the equation (3.41) for all $i \geq 0$ and $j = 0, \pm 1$.

We define a linear map $\tau : \widetilde{\underline{U}_0}^+ \to \underline{U}$ by

$$\tau(\underline{u}^+_i) := \tau_i(\underline{u}^+_i) \tag{3.44}$$

for any $i \geq 0$ and $\underline{u}^+_i \in (\underline{U})^+_i$. This τ is an isomorphism of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules. In fact, by the assumption that $\underline{U}$ is generated by V_1 and $\underline{U}_0$, we have the surjectivity of τ. Moreover, by the equation (3.41) in the cases where $i \geq 1$ and $j = -1$ and the definition of τ_0 and the transitivity of the positive extension of $\widetilde{\underline{U}_0}^+$, we have the injectivity of τ. Thus, τ is bijective. Moreover, since $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is generated by V_0, $V_{\pm 1}$, it follows that τ is a homomorphism of $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules from the equation (3.41). Therefore $\underline{U}$ is isomorphic to $\widetilde{\underline{U}_0}^+$ as $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules.

By the same argument, we can prove our claim for $(\underline{\varpi}, \underline{\mathcal{U}})$. ∎

As an application of Theorem 3.17, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ be a standard pentad and U, W (respectively $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W}$) be $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. Then the positive extension of $U \oplus W$ (respectively the negative extension of $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{W}$) with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of positive extensions of U and W (respectively negative extensions of $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{W}$) with respect to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$, i.e.*

$$\widetilde{(U \oplus W)}^+ \simeq \tilde{U}^+ \oplus \tilde{W}^+ \quad (\textit{respectively } \widetilde{(\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{W})}^- \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{W}}^-).$$

3.3 A pairing between $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$ and $(\tilde{\varpi}^-, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-)$

In the previous section, we constructed positively and negatively graded $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-modules. Next, let us try to embed these modules into some graded Lie algebra. For this, we need to embed $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$ into some standard pentad. However, as mentioned in Remark 2.5, the objects $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $\tilde{U}^+$ might not have a submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(\tilde{U}^+, \mathfrak{k})$ and a bilinear form on $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ satisfying the conditions (2.3) and (2.4). In the present and the next sections, we only consider the cases where B_0 is symmetric and U has a submodule $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{Hom}(U, \mathfrak{k})$ such that $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ is standard. Then, we can show that a pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is standard. First, in this section, we consider the negative extension $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$ of $\mathcal{U}$ and construct a non-degenerate invariant bilinear form $\tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \to \mathfrak{k}$ under the assumption (2.3) inductively (cf. [2, Remark 1.4]). In the next section, we shall construct the Φ-map of the pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$.

Definition 3.19. Let $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$ and $(\tilde{\varpi}^-, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-)$, $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{Hom}(U, \mathfrak{k})$ be $\mathfrak{g}$-modules such that the restriction of the canonical pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0 : U \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathfrak{k}$ is non-degenerate, and, let $\tilde{U}^+$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$ be the positive and negative extensions of U and $\mathcal{U}$ respectively. We define a bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0^0$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0^0 : & U_0^+ \times \mathcal{U}_0^- \to \mathfrak{k} \\ & (u_0^+, w_0^-) \mapsto \langle u_0^+, w_0^- \rangle_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Moreover, for $i \geq 1$, we define a bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-i}^i$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-i}^i : & U_i^+ \times \mathcal{U}_{-i}^- \to \mathfrak{k} \\ & (r_{i-1}^+(x_1 \otimes u_{i-1}^+), r_{-i+1}^-(y_{-1} \otimes w_{-i+1}^-)) \mapsto -\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes r_{i-1}^+(x_1 \otimes u_{i-1}^+)), w_{-i+1}^- \rangle_{-i+1}^{i-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

inductively.

The well-definedness of Definition 3.19 can be obtained by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.20. *Let $j \geq 0$. Assume that the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^j_{-j}$ defined in (3.46) is well-defined and satisfies the following equations:*

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(a\otimes u^+_j), w^-_{-j}\rangle^j_{-j} + \langle u^+_j, \tilde{\pi}^-(a\otimes w^-_{-j})\rangle^j_{-j} = 0, \tag{3.47}$$

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u^+_j)), w^-_{-j}\rangle^j_{-j} = \langle u^+_j, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes w^-_{-j}))\rangle^j_{-j} \tag{3.48}$$

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u^+_{j-1}), w^-_{-j}\rangle^j_{-j} = \begin{cases} -\langle u^+_{j-1}, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w^-_{-j})\rangle^{j-1}_{-j+1} & (j\geq 1)\\ 0 & (j=0)\end{cases} \tag{3.49}$$

for any $a\in\mathfrak{g}=V_0\subset L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$, $x_1\in V_1$, $y_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $u^+_{j-1}\in U^+_{j-1}$, $u^+_j\in U^+_j$ and $w^-_{-j}\in\mathcal{U}^-_{-j}$. Then the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1}$ defined in (3.46) is also well-defined and satisfies the following equations:

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(a\otimes u^+_{j+1}), w^-_{-j-1}\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1} + \langle u^+_{j+1}, \tilde{\pi}^-(a\otimes w^-_{-j-1})\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1} = 0, \tag{3.50}$$

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u^+_{j+1})), w^-_{-j-1}\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1} = \langle u^+_{j+1}, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes w^-_{-j-1}))\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1} \tag{3.51}$$

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u^+_j), w^-_{-j-1}\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1} = -\langle u^+_j, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w^-_{-j-1})\rangle^j_{-j} \tag{3.52}$$

for any $a\in\mathfrak{g}=V_0\subset L(\mathfrak{g},\rho,V,\mathcal{V},B_0)$, $x_1\in V_1$, $y_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $u^+_j\in U^+_j$, $u^+_{j+1}\in U^+_{j+1}$ and $w^-_{-j-1}\in\mathcal{U}^-_{-j-1}$.

Proof. First, we let $j=0$. It is clear that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^0_0$ satisfies (3.47) and (3.49). Let us show that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^0_0$ satisfies (3.48). Indeed, under the above notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u^+_0)), w_0\rangle^0_0 =& \langle\tilde{\pi}^+([y_{-1},x_1]\otimes u^+_0), w_0\rangle^0_0 = \langle u^+_0, \tilde{\pi}^-([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes w_0)\rangle^0_0\\ =& \langle u^+_0, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes w_0))\rangle^0_0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

Thus, the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^0_0$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.20.

Next, let us show that the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ is well-defined. Take arbitrary natural numbers $\nu,\mu\in\mathbb{N}$ and elements $x^1_1,\ldots,x^\nu_1\in V_1$, $u^{+,1}_0,\ldots,u^{+,\nu}_0\in U^+_0$, $y^1_{-1},\ldots,y^\mu_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $w^{-,1}_0,\ldots,w^{-,\mu}_0\in\mathcal{U}^-_0$ satisfying

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\nu} r^+_0(x^s_1\otimes u^{+,s}_0) = 0, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} r^-_0(y^t_{-1}\otimes w^{-,t}_0) = 0.$$

Then, for any $y_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $w^-_0\in\mathcal{U}^-_0$, $x_1\in V_1$ and $u^+_0\in U^+_0$, we have

$$\langle\sum_{s=1}^{\nu} r^+_0(x^s_1\otimes u^{+,s}_0)(y_{-1}), w^-_0\rangle^0_0 = 0, \tag{3.54}$$

and, by the equation (3.53), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\mu}\langle r^+_0(x_1\otimes u^+_0)(y^t_{-1}), w^{-,t}_0\rangle^0_0 = \sum_{t=1}^{\mu}\langle u^+_0, r^-_0(y^t_{-1}\otimes w^{-,t}_0)(x_1)\rangle^0_0 = 0. \tag{3.55}$$

By (3.54) and (3.55), we can obtain that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ is well-defined.

Let us consider properties of $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$. By (3.53), we have that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ satisfies

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+),w_{-1}^-\rangle^1_{-1}=-\langle u_0^+,\tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w_{-1}^-)\rangle^1_{-1} \tag{3.56}$$

for any $x_1\in V_1$, $u_0^+\in U_0^+$ and $w_{-1}^-\in\mathcal{U}_{-1}^-$, i.e. $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ satisfies the equation (3.52). Moreover, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ satisfies the equations (3.50) and (3.51). In fact, for all $a\in V_0$, $x_1\in V_1$, $y_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $u_0^+\in U_0^+$ and $w_0^-\in\mathcal{U}_0^-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(a\otimes r_0^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+)),r_0^-(y_{-1}\otimes w_0^-)\rangle^1_{-1}=-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(a\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+))),w_0^-\rangle^0_0\\
&\quad=-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(a\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+))),w_0^-\rangle^0_0+\langle\tilde{\pi}^+([a,y_{-1}]\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+)),w_0^-\rangle^0_0\\
&\quad=\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+)),\tilde{\pi}^-(a\otimes w_0^-)\rangle^0_0-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+),\tilde{\pi}^-([a,y_{-1}]\otimes w_0^-)\rangle^1_{-1}\\
&\quad=-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+),\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(a\otimes w_0^-))\rangle^1_{-1}-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+),\tilde{\pi}^-([a,y_{-1}]\otimes w_0^-)\rangle^1_{-1}\\
&\quad=-\langle r_0^+(x_1\otimes u_0^+),\tilde{\pi}^-(a\otimes r_0^-(y_{-1}\otimes w_0^-))\rangle^1_{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.57}$$

Thus $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ satisfies (3.50). And, from (3.56) and (3.57), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_1^+)),w_{-1}^-\rangle^1_{-1}\\
&\quad=\langle\tilde{\pi}^+([y_{-1},x_1]\otimes u_1^+),w_{-1}^-\rangle^1_{-1}+\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes u_1^+)),w_{-1}^-\rangle^1_{-1}\\
&\quad=-\langle u_1^+,\tilde{\pi}^-([y_{-1},x_1]\otimes w_{-1}^-)\rangle^1_{-1}-\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1}\otimes u_1^+),\tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w_{-1}^-)\rangle^0_0\\
&\quad=\langle u_1^+,\tilde{\pi}^-([x_1,y_{-1}]\otimes w_{-1}^-)\rangle^1_{-1}+\langle u_1^+,\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w_{-1}^-))\rangle^1_{-1}\\
&\quad=\langle u_1^+,\tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes\tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1}\otimes w_{-1}^-))\rangle^1_{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.58}$$

for any $x_1\in V_1$, $y_{-1}\in V_{-1}$, $u_1^+\in U_1^+$ and $w_{-1}^-\in\mathcal{U}_{-1}^-$. Thus $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^1_{-1}$ satisfies (3.51).

We let $j\geq 1$. Suppose that the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^j_{-j}$ is well-defined and satisfies the equations (3.47), (3.48) and (3.49). Let us show the well-definedness of $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1}$. Take arbitrary natural numbers $\nu,\mu\in\mathbb{N}$ and elements $x_1^1,\dots,x_1^\nu\in V_1$, $u_j^{+,1},\dots,u_j^{+,\nu}\in U_0^+$, $y_{-1}^1,\dots,y_{-1}^\mu\in V_{-1}$, $w_{-j}^{-,1},\dots,w_{-j}^{-,\mu}\in\mathcal{U}_0^-$ satisfying

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\nu}r_j^+(x_1^s\otimes u_j^{+,s})=0,\quad\sum_{t=1}^{\mu}r_{-j}^-(y_{-1}^t\otimes w_{-j}^{-,t})=0. \tag{3.59}$$

Then, by the equation (3.48) and the same argument to the argument of (3.54) and (3.55), we have the following equations:

$$\langle\sum_{s=1}^{\nu}r_j^+(x_1^s\otimes u_j^{+,s})(y_{-1}),w_{-j}^-\rangle^j_{-j}=0,\quad\sum_{t=1}^{\mu}\langle r_j^+(x_1\otimes u_j^+)(y_{-1}^t),w_{-j}^{-,t}\rangle^j_{-j}=0. \tag{3.60}$$

Thus, we have that the bilinear map $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1}$ is well-defined.

From the equation (3.48), we have

$$\langle\tilde{\pi}^+(x_1\otimes u_j^+),w_{-j-1}^-\rangle^{j+1}_{-j-1}=-\langle u_j^+,\tilde{\pi}^-(x_1\otimes w_{-j-1}^-)\rangle^j_{-j} \tag{3.61}$$

for any $x_1 \in V_1$, $u_j^+ \in U_j^+$ and $w_{-j-1} \in \mathcal{U}_{-j-1}^-$. We can show that the bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-j-1}^{j+1}$ satisfies the equation (3.52) from the equation (3.61) and that it also satisfies the equations (3.50) and (3.51) by the same argument to the argument of the case where $j = 0$. ∎

By Proposition 3.20, we can obtain pairings $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-j}^{j}$ for all $j \geq 0$ inductively. Then, we can define a pairing between $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$ and $(\tilde{\varpi}^-, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-)$.

Definition 3.21. We define a bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \to \mathfrak{k}$ by:

$$\langle u_n^+, w_{-m}^- \rangle := \begin{cases} \langle u_n^+, w_{-n}^- \rangle_{-n}^n & (n = m) \\ 0 & (n \neq m) \end{cases} \tag{3.62}$$

for any $n, m \geq 0$, $u_n^+ \in U_n^+ \subset \tilde{U}^+$ and $w_{-m}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-m}^- \subset \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$.

By Definition 3.19 and Proposition 3.20, we have that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ satisfies

$$\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(z_j \otimes \tilde{u}^+), \tilde{w}^- \rangle = -\langle \tilde{u}^+, \tilde{\pi}^-(z_j \otimes \tilde{w}^-) \rangle \tag{3.63}$$

for $j = 0, \pm 1$ and any $z_j \in V_j$, $\tilde{u}^+ \in \tilde{U}^+$, $\tilde{w}^- \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$.

Proposition 3.22. *The bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \to \mathfrak{k}$ is non-degenerate and $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-invariant (cf. [2, Definition 1.4 and Remark 1.4]).*

Proof. First, let us show that the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is non-degenerate. For this, it is sufficient to show that the bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-j}^{j} : U_j^+ \times \mathcal{U}_{-j} \to \mathfrak{k}$ is non-degenerate for each $j \geq 0$. We show it by induction on j. For $j = 0$, it follows that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0^0$ is non-degenerate from the assumption. For $j + 1$, we take an element $u_{j+1}^+ \in U_{j+1}^+$ which satisfies $\langle u_{j+1}^+, r_{-j}^-(y_{-1} \otimes w_{-j}^-) \rangle_{-j-1}^{j+1} = 0$ for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$ and $w_{-j}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-j}^-$. Then, we have

$$0 = \langle u_{j+1}^+, r_{-j}^-(y_{-1} \otimes w_{-j}^-) \rangle_{-j-1}^{j+1} = -\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_{j+1}^+), w_{-j}^- \rangle_{-j}^{j} = -\langle u_{j+1}^+(y_{-1}), w_{-j}^- \rangle_{-j}^{j}.$$

By the induction hypothesis that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-j}^{j}$ is non-degenerate, we can obtain that $u_{j+1}^+(y_{-1}) = 0$ for any $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, and, thus, we have $u_{j+1}^+ = 0 \in U_{j+1}^+ \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V_{-1}, U_j^+)$. Similarly, we can show that an element $w_{-j-1}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-j-1}^-$ which satisfies $\langle r_j^+(x_1 \otimes u_j^+), w_{-j-1}^- \rangle_{-j-1}^{j+1} = 0$ for any $x_1 \in V_1$ and $u_i^+ \in U_i^+$ is 0 by (3.63). Summarizing the above argument, we can obtain that the map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{-j-1}^{j+1}$ is non-degenerate. Therefore, by induction, we can obtain that the bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \to \mathfrak{k}$ is non-degenerate.

Next, let us show that the bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-invariant. For this, it is sufficient to show that the following equation holds:

$$\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(x_j \otimes u_n^+), w_{-n-j}^- \rangle_{-n-j}^{n+j} + \langle u_n^+, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_j \otimes w_{-n-j}^-) \rangle_{-n}^{n} = 0 \tag{3.64}$$

for any $j, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_j \in V_j$, $u_n \in U_n^+$ and $w_{-n-j}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-n-j}^-$. We shall show it by induction on j. Assume that $j \geq 0$. For $j = 0, 1$, the equation (3.64) follows from (3.63) immediately. For $j+1$, by induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \tilde{\pi}^+([v_1, x_j] \otimes u_n^+), w_{-n-j-1}^- \rangle_{-n-j-1}^{n+j+1} \\
&\quad = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(v_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_j \otimes u_n^+)), w_{-n-j-1}^- \rangle_{-n-j-1}^{n+j+1} - \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(x_j \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(v_1 \otimes u_n^+)), w_{-n-j-1}^- \rangle_{-n-j-1}^{n+j+1} \\
&\quad = -\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(x_j \otimes u_n^+), \tilde{\pi}^-(v_1 \otimes w_{-n-j-1}^-) \rangle_{-n-j}^{n+j} + \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(v_1 \otimes u_n^+), \tilde{\pi}^-(x_j \otimes w_{-n-j-1}^-) \rangle_{-n-1}^{n+1} \\
&\quad = \langle u_n^+, \tilde{\pi}^-(x_j \otimes \tilde{\pi}^-(v_1 \otimes w_{-n-j-1}^-)) \rangle_{-n}^{n} - \langle u_n^+, \tilde{\pi}^-(v_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^-(x_j \otimes w_{-n-j-1}^-)) \rangle_{-n}^{n} \\
&\quad = -\langle u_n^+, \tilde{\pi}^-([v_1, x_j] \otimes w_{-n-j-1}^-) \rangle_{-n}^{n}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_1 \in V_1$, $v_j \in V_j$, $u_n^+ \in U_n^+$ and $w_{-n-j-1}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-n-j-1}^-$. Thus, by induction, we can show the equation (3.64) for all $j \geq 0$. Similarly, we can obtain the equation (3.64) for all $j \leq 0$. Thus, we have the equation (3.64) for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore the bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \tilde{U}^+ \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^- \to \mathfrak{k}$ is $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-invariant. ∎

By Proposition 3.22, we can regard $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-$ as an $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$-submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(\tilde{U}^+, \mathfrak{k})$.

3.4 The Φ-map between $(\tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+)$ and $(\tilde{\varpi}^-, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-)$

We retain to assume that a pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ is standard and the bilinear form B_0 is symmetric. As I proved in section 3.3, a pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ satisfies the condition (2.3). Let us construct the Φ-map of the pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ and show that it is standard.

Definition 3.23. Assume that pentads $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ are standard and that B_0 is symmetric. We define a linear map $\tilde{\Phi}_0^0 : U_0^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_0^- \to V_0$ as:

$$\tilde{\Phi}_0^0(u_0^+ \otimes w_0^-) := \Phi_\pi(u_0^+ \otimes w_0^-) \tag{3.66}$$

where $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $u_0^+ \in U_0^+$, $w_0^- \in \mathcal{U}_0^-$ and Φ_π is the Φ-map of $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$.

Moreover, for each $i \geq 0$, we inductively define a linear map $\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1} : U_{i+1}^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_0^- \to V_{i+1}$ by:

$$\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1}(r_i^+(x_1 \otimes u_i^+) \otimes w_0^-) := [x_1, \tilde{\Phi}_0^i(u_i^+ \otimes w_0^-)], \tag{3.67}$$

where $x_1 \in V_1$, $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $u_i^+ \in U_i^+$ and $w_0^- \in \mathcal{U}_0^-$.

Assume that an integer $j \geq 0$ satisfies a condition that we have linear maps $\tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^k : U_k^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_{-j}^- \to V_{k-j}$ for all $k \geq 0$. Then, for any $k \geq 0$, we define a linear map $\tilde{\Phi}_{-j-1}^k : U_k^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_{-j-1}^- \to V_{k-j-1}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\Phi}_{-j-1}^k(u_k^+ \otimes r_{-j}^-(y_{-1} \otimes w_{-j}^-)) \\
&\quad := \begin{cases} [y_{-1}, \tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^0(u_0^+ \otimes w_{-j}^-)] & (k = 0) \\ [y_{-1}, \tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^k(u_k^+ \otimes w_{-j}^-)] - \tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^{k-1}(\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u_k^+) \otimes w_{-j}^-) & (k \geq 1) \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

where $y_{-1} \in V_{-1}$, $u_k^+ \in U_k^+$ and $w_{-j}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-j}^-$.

Consequently, we can define linear maps $\tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^i : U_i^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_{-j}^- \to V_{i-j}$ for all $i, j \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.24. *The linear map $\tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^i$ is well-defined and satisfies the following equation:*

$$B_L(a_{-i+j}, \tilde{\Phi}_{-j}^i(u_i^+ \otimes w_{-j}^-)) = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-i+j} \otimes u_i^+), w_{-j}^- \rangle \tag{3.69}$$

for any $i, j \geq 0$, $a_{-i+j} \in V_{-i+j}$, $u_i^+ \in U_i^+$ and $w_{-j}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-j}^-$.

Proof. Let us show that the linear maps defined by the equations (3.66), (3.67) and (3.68) satisfy our claim by induction. First, let us show that the linear map $\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1}$ $(i \geq 0)$ defined in (3.67) is well-defined by induction on i. For $i = 0$, under the above notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_L(a_{-1}, [x_1, \tilde{\Phi}_0^0(u_0^+ \otimes w_0^-)]) =& B_L([a_{-1}, x_1], \tilde{\Phi}_0^0(u_0^+ \otimes w_0^-)) = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+([a_{-1}, x_1] \otimes u_0^+), w_0^- \rangle \\ =& \langle r_0^+(x_1 \otimes u_0^+)(a_{-1}), w_0^- \rangle = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-1} \otimes r_0^+(x_1 \otimes u_0^+)), w_0^- \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{3.70}$$

for any $a_{-1} \in V_{-1}$. Thus, if $x_1^1, \ldots, x_1^l \in V_1$ and $u_0^{+,1}, \ldots, u_0^{+,l} \in U_0^+$ satisfy $\sum_{s=1}^l r_0^+(x_1^s \otimes u_0^{+,s}) = 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} B_L(a_{-1}, [x_1^s, \tilde{\Phi}_0^0(u_0^{+,s} \otimes w_0^-)]) = 0 \tag{3.71}$$

for any $a_{-1} \in V_{-1}$. Since the restriction of B_L to $V_{-1} \times V_1$ is non-degenerate, we have

$$\sum_{s=1}^{l} [x_1^s, \tilde{\Phi}_0^0(u_0^{+,s} \otimes w_0^-)] = 0, \tag{3.72}$$

and, thus, the map $\tilde{\Phi}_0^1$ is well-defined. The equation (3.69) follows from (3.70).

For $i \geq 1$, under the notation of (3.67), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_L(a_{-i-1}, [x_1, \tilde{\Phi}_0^i(u_i^+ \otimes w_0^-)]) = B_L([a_{-i-1}, x_1], \tilde{\Phi}_0^i(u_i^+ \otimes w_0^-)) = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+([a_{-i-1}, x_1] \otimes u_i^+), w_0^- \rangle \\ &\quad = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-i-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes u_i^+)), w_0^- \rangle - \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(x_1 \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-i-1} \otimes u_i^+)), w_0^- \rangle \\ &\quad = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-i-1} \otimes r_i^+(x_1 \otimes u_i^+)), w_0^- \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{3.73}$$

by the induction hypothesis for any $a_{-i-1} \in V_{-i-1}$. Thus, by the same argument to the argument of the case where $i = 0$, we have the well-definedness of $\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1}$ and that $\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1}$ satisfies the equation (3.69). Therefore, by induction, we can obtain our claim on $\tilde{\Phi}_0^{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Let us show that the linear maps defined in (3.68) are well-defined. We assume that an integer $i \geq 0$ satisfies the condition that we have linear maps $\tilde{\Phi}_{-i}^k : U_k^+ \otimes \mathcal{U}_{-i}^- \to V_{k-i}$ for all $k \geq 0$ which satisfy the equation (3.69). When $i = 0$, it has been shown that this assumption holds. Then, we can show the well-definedness of the linear maps $\tilde{\Phi}_{-1}^k$ $(k \geq 0)$ by induction on k. When $k = 0$, we

can show that $\tilde{\Phi}^0_{-1}$ is well-defined and satisfies (3.69) by a similar argument to the argument of (3.67). When $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_L(a_{-k+1}, [y_{-1}, \tilde{\Phi}^k_0(u^+_k \otimes w^-_0)] - \tilde{\Phi}^{k-1}_0(\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_k) \otimes w^-_0)) \\
&\quad = B_L([a_{-k+1}, y_{-1}], \tilde{\Phi}^k_0(u^+_k \otimes w^-_0)) - B_L(a_{-k+1}, \tilde{\Phi}^{k-1}_0(\tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_k) \otimes w^-_0)) \\
&\quad = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+([a_{-k+1}, y_{-1}] \otimes u^+_k), w^-_0 \rangle - \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-k+1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes u^+_k)), w^-_0 \rangle \\
&\quad = -\langle \tilde{\pi}^+(y_{-1} \otimes \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-k+1} \otimes u^+_k)), w^-_0 \rangle \\
&\quad = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-k+1} \otimes u^+_k), \tilde{\pi}^-(y_{-1} \otimes w^-_0) \rangle = \langle \tilde{\pi}^+(a_{-k+1} \otimes u^+_k), r^-_0(y_{-1} \otimes w^-_0) \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{3.74}$$

for any $k \geq 1$ and $a_{-k+1} \in V_{-k+1}$ under the notation of (3.68). Thus, by a similar argument to the argument of (3.67), we have the well-definedness of $\tilde{\Phi}^k_{-1}$ for all $k \geq 1$ and that $\tilde{\Phi}^k_{-1}$ satisfies the equation (3.69). For $i \geq 1$, by the same argument to the argument of the case where $i = 0$, we have the well-definedness of $\tilde{\Phi}^k_{-i-1}$ for all $k \geq 0$ and that $\tilde{\Phi}^k_{-i-1}$ satisfies the equation (3.69). Thus, by induction, we have linear maps $\tilde{\Phi}^i_{-j}$ for all $i, j \geq 0$ which satisfies the equation (3.69). This completes the proof. ∎

As a corollary of Propositions 3.22 and 3.24, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.25. *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ be standard pentads and assume that B_0 is symmetric. Then a pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is also a standard pentad whose Φ-map, denoted by $\tilde{\Phi}^+_\pi$, is defined by:*

$$\tilde{\Phi}^+_\pi(u^+_i \otimes w^-_{-j}) := \tilde{\Phi}^i_{-j}(u^+_i \otimes w^-_{-j}) \tag{3.75}$$

for any $i, j \geq 0$, $u^+_i \in U^+_i$ and $w^-_{-j} \in \mathcal{U}^-_{-j}$, where $\tilde{\Phi}^i_{-j}$ is the linear map defined in Definition 3.23.

3.5 Chain rule

Under the assumptions of sections 3.3 and 3.4, let us construct the Lie algebra associated with a standard pentad of the form $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, U^+, \mathcal{U}^-, B_L)$. To find the structure of the Lie algebra $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, U^+, \mathcal{U}^-, B_L)$, we give the following theorem.

Theorem 3.26 (chain rule)**.** *Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ be standard pentads. Assume that B_0 is symmetric. Then a pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is also a standard pentad and the Lie algebra associated with it is isomorphic to $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0)$, i.e. we have*

$$L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) \simeq L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0) \tag{3.76}$$

as Lie algebras.

Proof. Note that the pentad $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ is a standard pentad whose Φ-map $\Phi_{\rho \oplus \pi}$ is given by:

$$\Phi_{\rho \oplus \pi}((v, u) \otimes (\phi, \psi)) = \Phi_\rho(v \otimes \phi) + \Phi_\pi(u \otimes \psi)$$

where $v \in V$, $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$, $u \in U$, $\psi \in \mathcal{U}$ and Φ_ρ and Φ_π are the Φ-maps of the pentads $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \pi, U, \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ respectively. It has been already shown in Theorem 3.25 that the pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is standard. We denote the n-graduations of $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ by V_n and $(\tilde{U}^+)_n$, i.e.

$$L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n, \quad L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\tilde{U}^+)_m. \tag{3.77}$$

Moreover, we denote $(\tilde{U}^+)_1$ and $(\tilde{U}^+)_{-1}$ by:

$$(\tilde{U}^+)_1 = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} U_i^+, \quad (\tilde{U}^+)_{-1} = \bigoplus_{j \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_{-j}^-. \tag{3.78}$$

Denote a bilinear form on $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ defined in Definition 2.18 by $\overline{B}_L$. By Lemmas 2.37 and 2.38, we can define derivations α and β on $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, U^+, \mathcal{U}^-, B_L)$ which satisfy

$$\alpha(v_n) = nv_n, \quad \alpha(u_i^+) = iu_i^+, \quad \alpha(w_{-j}^-) = -jw_{-j}^-, \quad \beta(\tilde{u}_m^+) = m\tilde{u}_m^+ \tag{3.79}$$

and

$$\overline{B}_L(\alpha(\overline{z}), \overline{\omega}) + \overline{B}_L(\overline{z}, \alpha(\overline{\omega})) = \overline{B}_L(\beta(\overline{z}), \overline{\omega}) + \overline{B}_L(\overline{z}, \beta(\overline{\omega})) = 0 \tag{3.80}$$

for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i, j \geq 0$, $v_n \in V_n$, $u_i^+ \in U_i^+ \subset (\tilde{U}^+)_1$, $w_{-j}^- \in \mathcal{U}_{-j}^- \subset (\tilde{U}^+)_{-1}$, $\tilde{u}_m^+ \in (\tilde{U}^+)_m$ and $\overline{z}, \overline{\omega} \in L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$. Since $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is generated by $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\tilde{U}^+)_{\pm 1}$ and since $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0)$ and $(\tilde{U}^+)_{\pm 1}$ are generated by V_0, $V_{\pm 1}$, $U = U_0^+$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_0^-$, we have that $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is generated by V_0, $V_{\pm 1}$, U_0^+ and $\mathcal{U}_0^-$. Put

$$W_{(n,m)} := \{\overline{X} \in L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) \mid \alpha(\overline{X}) = n\overline{X},\ \beta(\overline{X}) = m\overline{X}\}$$

for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we can easily show that all eigenvalues of α and β are integers by induction and that $[W_{(n,m)}, W_{(k,l)}] \subset W_{(n+k,m+l)}$. Thus, we can obtain the following $\mathbb{Z}$-grading of $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ induced by the eigenspace decomposition of $\gamma := \alpha + \beta$:

$$L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \Big(\bigoplus_{n+m=k} W_{(n,m)} \Big).$$

If we put $W_k^\gamma := \{\overline{X} \mid \gamma(\overline{X}) = k\overline{X}\}$, then we have $W_k^\gamma = \bigoplus_{n+m=k} W_{(n,m)}$ and, thus, we can obtain the following $\mathbb{Z}$-grading of $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$:

$$L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} W_k^\gamma.$$

In particular,

$$W_0^\gamma = V_0, \quad W_1^\gamma = V_1 \oplus U_0^+, \quad W_{-1}^\gamma = V_{-1} \oplus \mathcal{U}_0^-. \tag{3.81}$$

We can easily show that $W_{k+1}^\gamma = [W_1^\gamma, W_k^\gamma]$, $W_{-k-1}^\gamma = [W_{-1}^\gamma, W_{-k}^\gamma]$ for all $k \geq 1$ and that the restriction of $\overline{B}_L$ to $W_k^\gamma \times W_{-k}^\gamma$ is non-degenerate for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ from (3.80). Therefore, by Theorem 2.20, we have the equation (3.76). ∎

Example 3.27. We retain to use the notations of Examples 2.35 and 3.16. Put $\mathcal{U} := \mathbb{C}$ and define a representation $\varpi : \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$ and a bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U : U \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{C}$ by:

$$\varpi((a, b, A) \otimes w) := -aw, \quad \langle u, w \rangle_U := uw.$$

We can identify $\mathcal{U}$ with $\mathrm{Hom}(U, \mathbb{C})$ via $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U$. Then pentads $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ and $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ are standard. Let us show that the Lie algebra $L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho \oplus \pi, V \oplus U, \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{U}, B_0)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_4$. Put elements

$$H_0 := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{5}{4} & & & \\ & \frac{1}{4} & & \\ & & \frac{-3}{4} & \\ & & & \frac{-3}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_1 := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{4} & & & \\ & \frac{-1}{4} & & \\ & & \frac{-1}{4} & \\ & & & \frac{-1}{4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_2 := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & \\ & & \frac{-1}{2} & \\ & & & \frac{-1}{2} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}_4.$$

Then we can obtain a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading of $\mathfrak{sl}_4$ by the eigenspace decomposition of ad H_0:

$$\mathfrak{sl}_4 = \bigoplus_{i=-2}^{2} \mathfrak{l}_i \quad (\mathfrak{l}_i := \{X \in \mathfrak{sl}_4 \mid [H_0, X] = iX\}). \tag{3.82}$$

In particular,

$$\mathfrak{l}_0 = \{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & \\ 0 & 0 & & A \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{C}, A \in \mathfrak{gl}_2, a + b + \mathrm{Tr}(A) = 0\} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2,$$

$$\mathfrak{l}_1 = \{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v_1 & v_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid u, v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{C}\}, \quad \mathfrak{l}_{-1} = \{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \psi & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid \psi, \phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Then, we have that $\mathfrak{l}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}H_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}H_2 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$ and that the restriction of a bilinear form T, defined by $T(X, X') := \mathrm{Tr}(XX')$ $(X, X' \in \mathfrak{sl}_4)$, to $\mathfrak{l}_0 \times \mathfrak{l}_0$ satisfies:

$$T\,|_{\mathfrak{l}_0 \times \mathfrak{l}_0}\,((a, b, A), (a', b', A')) = \frac{3}{4}aa' + bb' + \frac{1}{2}(ab' + a'b) + \mathrm{Tr}(AA'),$$

where $a, a' \in \mathbb{C}H_1,\ b, b' \in \mathbb{C}H_2,\ A, A' \in \mathfrak{sl}_2$. Thus, we can easily show that the grading (3.82) and the Killing form of $\mathfrak{sl}_4$, denoted by $K_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}$, satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.20 and that a pentad $(\mathfrak{l}_0, \mathrm{ad}, \mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_{-1}, K_{\mathfrak{sl}_4}\,|_{\mathfrak{l}_0\times\mathfrak{l}_0})$ is equivalent to $(\mathfrak{g}, \rho\oplus\pi, V\oplus U, \mathcal{V}\oplus\mathcal{U}, B_0)$ (cf. [5, 6, 7, the theory of prehomogeneous vector spaces of parabolic type]). Thus, by Theorems 2.20 and 3.26, we have

$$L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L) \simeq L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho\oplus\pi, V\oplus U, \mathcal{V}\oplus\mathcal{U}, B_0) \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_4.$$

In this case, we can directly check that the Lie algebra $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_4$ using Examples 2.34, 2.35 and 3.16. In fact, by the results of Examples 2.35 and 3.16, we have that the pentad $(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is equivalent to the pentad $(\mathfrak{gl}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_3, \Lambda_1, \mathbb{C}^3, \mathbb{C}^3, \kappa_3)$, which is defined in Example 2.34. Thus, we have that the Lie algebra $L(L(\mathfrak{g}, \rho, V, \mathcal{V}, B_0), \tilde{\pi}^+, \tilde{U}^+, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^-, B_L)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_4$.

References

[1] N. Bourbaki. Lie groups and Lie algebra. Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[2] Shen. Guangyu. Graded modules of graded Lie algebras of Cartan type (II)-positive and negative graded modules. Scientica Senia (Ser. A) 29. no.10 (1986), 1009–1019.

[3] V. G. Kac. Simple irreducible graded Lie algebras of finite growth. Math. USSR-Izvestija vol. 2 (1968), No.6. 1271–1311.

[4] V. G. Kac. Infinite dimensional Lie algebras, third edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[5] H. Rubenthaler. Espaces préhomogènes de type parabolique. Lect. Math. Kyoto Univ. **14** (1982), 189–221.

[6] H. Rubenthaler. Espaces préhomogènes de type parabolique. Thèse d'Etat, Université de Strasbourg, (1982).

[7] H. Rubenthaler. Algèbres de Lie et espaces préhomogènes (Travaux en cours). Hermann, Paris, (1992).

[8] H. Rubenthaler. Graded Lie algebras associated to a representation of a quadratic algebra. arXiv:1410. 0031v2 (2014).

[9] N. Sasano. Lie algebras generated by Lie modules. Kyushu Journal of Mathematics. vol. 68, No. 2 (2014), 377–403.

Lie algebras constructed with Lie modules and their modules

Nagatoshi Sasano
Institute of Mathematics-for-Industry
Kyushu University
744, Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395
Japan
E-mail: n-sasano@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp